THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XI DECEMBER, 1925 No. 66

EDITORIAL

Among the many appeals to our generosity which the approach of Christmas brings none makes more claims upon us than that issued by Sir Henry Lunn on behalf of the Assyrians and Iraq Christians; and we trust that it will be widely supported. The Assyrian refugees in Iraq have lately been joined by some thousands of Chaldeans, just escaped from Turkish territory and from all the brutality that the proximity of the Turk always portends for Christians; and the provision of food and clothing is an urgent necessity. The sum of £100,000 is asked for to meet the immediate needs of the present winter; and it is intended that the Committee shall continue in existence to watch over the future interests of the Christians of Northern Iraq generally. Meanwhile, *bis dat qui cito dat.* Any contributions should be forwarded to the Westminster Bank, New Oxford Street, London, Assyrians and Iraq Christian Committee account, or to the Rev. Canon Douglas and Rev. C. F. Ream, Honorary Secretaries, 3 and 4, Memorial Hall, London, E.C. 4.

The powerful sermon preached in the University pulpit at Oxford by Mr. Kirk, and printed in this issue, affords a crushing refutation of the loose and ill-informed language recently used about the Catholic doctrine of the Sacraments. We have refrained hitherto from any criticism of the public utterances of the Bishop of Birmingham; though the convincing exposure of his arguments and accusations made by the English Church Union in *The Times* at the end of July last might have seemed to call for some comment. But the situation has now reached a phase where, as the Bishop himself has said, the issues are of far more than diocesan importance; and it is surprising that he should not realize the bearing of this fact upon his own disciplinary injunctions. He is not now dealing with a few clergy in his diocese who wish to reserve the Blessed

Sacrament with reverence. On the contrary, by his misrepresentation and mockery of the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, he has profoundly shocked and aroused the conscience of the great body of English Churchmen; and it goes without saying that those whom he is attacking have behind them the united support and prayers of every section of Catholic opinion in the country.

The plight of our fellow-Christians in the Mosul area and the age-long conflict between Christian and Turk of which it is at the moment the poignant symbol lend extraordinary interest to a paper by the great Oriental scholar, Dr. Mingana, of Manchester University, first published in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* for July last, and now reprinted with additions under the title of *The Early Spread of Christianity in Central Asia and the Far East: A New Document.* The new document is a letter purporting to be by the monophysite Bishop, Philoxenus, who died in A.D. 523; and Dr. Mingana publishes a full translation of it from the Syriac, together with introduction and notes. The letter is twofold, and the centre of interest lies in the second part. This portion is difficult to date, but Dr. Mingana thinks that it belongs to the latter half of the eighth century. It describes, in a style which recalls the best manner of Herodotus, the life and customs of some Christian Turks, whose see city was perhaps Baghdad. Their Metropolitan was ordained by the Nestorian Catholicos in Ctesiphon; but they were themselves orthodox believers in the Holy Trinity. They used Turkish versions of the Old and New Testaments and of the writings of the Fathers; kept both their feasts and fasts with great solemnity; and used wafer-bread for the Eucharist, though both bread and wine had to be imported from a distance. They were, further, a very prosperous people, rich in sheep, cattle, camels, and horses; and they appear to have had a very strong antipathy to the Muslims.

But the whole paper is of fascinating interest. It is published by the Manchester University Press and by Messrs. Longmans at the modest price of a florin.

WHAT IS THE GOSPEL?*

III

We see then that, though the Lord's own Gospel was the Gospel of the Father, and of the blessings of His coming rule, He prepared the Apostles to preach a Gospel which would be also the Gospel of the Son, both as the Christ, through Whom the Kingdom would come, and as the Suffering Servant, Who would enable men to enter into it. But was the Gospel to be also the Gospel of the Holy Ghost? Certainly we shall find that it was this when we reach the Acts of the Apostles; but how far the preparation of the Apostles to preach this aspect of it went during the Lord's earthly life it is not quite easy to say, since the answer to this question turns so largely upon the view that we take of the discourses of the Fourth Gospel. We must recognize the fact that the promise of the Spirit is not prominent in the Synoptic Gospels, though St. Luke's is a link between the two first Gospels and the fourth. In some synoptic passages the meaning of the Holy Spirit seems to be identical with its Old Testament meaning; it is simply a synonym for the Divine activity. So it is, I think, when the Baptist speaks of the Great One to come as baptizing with the Holy Ghost, or when the Lord speaks of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost: the blasphemy here in view is blasphemy against the Divine activity manifest in Himself when He casts out devils by the Spirit of God. Indeed, perhaps the only passage which occurs in St. Matthew's and St. Mark's Gospels, dealing with the coming gift of the Spirit, is that in which the Lord tells His disciples, when they are delivered up, not to be anxious beforehand what they shall speak; "but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost." With St. Luke's Gospel the case is different; not only are his references to the action of the Holy Ghost far more frequent—the first two chapters supply a great many—but he makes our Lord speak of the Holy Ghost as the Father's characteristic gift, and definitely promise to send Him after His departure. "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?" (Luke xi. 13). And, again, after the Resurrection: "Behold, I send forth the promise of My Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high" (Luke xxiv. 49). The same promise is found in the account of the teaching of the Risen Lord given

* These articles comprise the substance of lectures delivered by Professor Goudge at the Oxford Summer School for Clergy in July, 1925.

in the Acts. We must not, however, forget that, just as the Lord taught His Christship by what He was even more than by what He said, so He taught His Apostles to look for the coming of the Holy Ghost also. Those words which we find in the Fourth Gospel, "Ye know Him: for He abideth with you, and shall be in you" (John xiv. 17), are surely significant. The Spirit was no stranger when He came to be in the Apostles at Pentecost. Though He had not been in them before, He had abided with them, since He had dwelt in the Lord Who had abided with them. The Holy Spirit, the Apostles knew, had descended on the Lord at His baptism, and made Him the Christ that He was. The Lord had been "led by the Spirit"; He had gone forth to His ministry "in the power of the Spirit"; His sermon at Nazareth had begun with the words, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me" (Luke iv. 1, 14). Thus it would hardly be too much to say that every call which the Lord gave to His Apostles to carry on His work was in effect a promise of the Spirit. When, for instance, in the parable of the talents, our Lord speaks of the traveller going into another country, who "called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods; and unto one he gave four talents, to another two, to another one, to each according to his several ability" (Matt. xxv. 14, 15), it is the gifts of the Spirit, and not natural talents, which are in view. Natural talents of one kind or another are presupposed when the Lord speaks of the "several ability" of each; "the gifts" are "His goods," the powers by which His own work had been done.

Now it is when we recognize all this that we see how extremely improbable it is that the great discourse of John xiv.-xvi., with its promises of the Spirit, is but the work of the Evangelist. It is not merely the wonder and beauty and power of the discourse itself, and the exactness of its correspondence with the subsequent experience of the Apostles; it is that, while the Synoptic Gospels show that the thought contained in it was by no means alien to the Lord's mind, they do not show us the Lord, as the end of His life drew near, as giving to the Apostles the teaching which the situation seemed so imperatively to demand. If the Spirit was to come and do for the Apostles all that He actually did, why did the Lord not tell them so? Why should He encourage them by the promise of the Spirit, in view of the legal trials, which would be only occasional, and not so encourage them, in view of the continual and far greater difficulties of their evangelistic work? The conclusion suggested is plain. Our Lord did say to the Apostles before His death substantially what the Evangelist tells us that He said about the coming of the Holy Ghost; and what He thus said to them was

a most important part of their preparation for the preaching of the Gospel.

In what, then, did this preparation consist? It consisted, first, in a real addition to the substance of the Gospel; and, secondly, in the promise of a complete enabling to preach it. It is the substance of the Gospel with which in these lectures we are chiefly concerned. To those who believe in Jesus as the Christ, and receive the remission of sins which, as the Servant of Yahweh, He has won for them, there will be given the gift of the Holy Ghost. Do not let us fail to notice that in the great discourse the gift is neither for the Apostles alone, nor simply for the effectual preaching of the Gospel. The Holy Spirit is to fill the place of Christ, not only for the Apostles with their peculiar vocation, but for all the people of God. In all alike the Holy Spirit, as has been well said, will be given, not to take the place of an absent Christ, but "to accomplish His presence." It is the glorified Lord Who will send the Spirit; and in the coming of the Spirit He Himself will come. The old vine of Israel, the people of God, the vine of God's planting, will have become in its faithful remnant the true vine, Christ; all will abide in Him and He in them. That will be the great gift which the Gospel immediately offers—the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Divine life in the Christ, from Whom He comes. Is that to substitute something else for the gift of the kingdom? Not at all. It is by the presence of the Spirit that the Divine rule is bestowed upon us, in the corporate life of the Church, and in the individual life also. The Church is the kingdom of God in so far, and only in so far, as through the Spirit's presence the rule of God is received and obeyed. Thus, as St. Paul teaches, the Spirit is "the earnest of our inheritance," not the whole of the promised kingdom, but the great sum paid on account, the security that the rest will follow. The present gift of the Spirit is not all, for as yet it affects little more than the inward man; we must wait for the redemption of the body, and of the physical world. But it is a great sum paid on account, as earnest-money in the East was in the first century, and not a little sum, as earnest-money generally is with ourselves to-day. It is a gift for heart, mind, and will alike, transforming the whole man, if he will but co-operate with it. It is the Spirit of love, of illumination, and of power alike, making us free from the law of sin and of death. That is what the Gospel will have to offer, and in offering that it will offer us everything which at present we need, though there is more to follow.

But then we must not altogether forget the other aspect of the gift. Just because the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of love and light and power, He will be the great source of evangelistic

success. Our Lord in the great discourse dwells chiefly upon the last two aspects of His work. The Spirit is "the Spirit of truth"—so the Lord says repeatedly. "He shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you" (John xiv. 26). The presence of the Spirit does not mean that the immediate revelations which He bestows will ever make the Lord's words out of date; on the contrary, it is the Spirit Who will enable us to remember them, and to use them aright. "He shall bear witness of Me: and ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with Me from the beginning" (John xv. 26, 27). Nor does it mean that the life of the Lord will ever be out of date; knowledge of it is necessary for witness, and the Spirit will use this knowledge to reveal Christ to the world. And, again, the Lord says: "When He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He shall guide you into all the truth: for He shall not speak from Himself; but what things soever He shall hear, these shall He speak: and He shall declare unto you the things that are to come" (John xvi. 13). What are these things? They are, if I rightly understand our Lord, the things that were immediately to come when the Lord was speaking—His Death and the Glory that would follow it, His gift of the Holy Ghost and rebuilding of the Church. The Spirit would light them all up, enable the Apostles to understand them, and to explain their meaning. In all these ways—by the words, the life, the redeeming experience of the Christ remembered and understood—the Spirit will glorify the Christ, "for He shall take of Mine and shall declare it unto you" (John xvi. 14). So there will be a wonderful power in the Apostles' witness: "He, when He is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on Me; of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye behold Me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world hath been judged" (John xvi. 8 *ff.*).

IV

We see, then, that, restricted as the Lord's own Gospel necessarily was, He had prepared for the preaching of a far fuller one before He died; and its preaching was only waiting for the Lord's redeeming work to be accomplished and the Spirit to be given. It is to that Gospel that we shall turn in the final lecture. In the time that remains to-day, I should like to offer a few suggestions as to our own work; they will arise entirely out of our Lord's example.

The first is this: Do we not need to remember that our evangelistic message must always be good news? Men will listen to good news as they will listen to nothing else. And

what do they regard as good news? That something has been, or will be, done for them, and not that something has been, or will be, asked of them. To say this is not to deprecate moral appeals. If we are to profit by what is done for us, action on our part may be imperative; but we must first be assured that the prize is there. Our Lord did not begin with moral demands alone; He began with the promise of a better world. There would be release for captives, sight for the blind, liberty for the downtrodden, for all God's children the land of heart's desire. The moral teaching showed what was necessary, if men desired the blessing to be their own.

Good news, then, first; and, secondly, the good news of the kingdom. Do we not need to restore the thought of the kingdom of God to that great place which it has in the Bible, and which it has so lost among ourselves? That thought, perhaps, will attach itself more easily to what is already in men's minds than any other which the Bible gives to us. That profound discontent which men feel with their present position, their conviction that it is the fault of the system under which they live—these things are right. Our ills do arise from the system under which we live, from our foolish and wicked misgovernment of ourselves, and the foolish and wicked misgovernment of us by others; and God is ready to set all right by bestowing Himself upon us as our King. None of the evils from which we suffer correspond to God's true and perfect will. The day is coming when His judgment will sweep this all away, and then woe to all—woe to ourselves, perhaps—whom He finds identified with them! And if we are asked what we are talking about, and whether we are but trying to put men off with the thought of heaven, when what they ask is justice here on earth, we shall reply that we are speaking both of the life of this world and of the life of the world to come. Not for a moment shall we listen to the modern nonsense, which condemns as "dope" the promise of the kingdom of the future; our Lord tells us to promise it. This world, even at its best, will not satisfy such men and women as we are. But the kingdom and its blessings should begin for us here; they are for all who will attach themselves to the Lord and His people. The Church should be the twilight of God; light, if we compare it with the surrounding darkness, though dark if we compare it with the coming day. There, in the company of God's people, many of the evils from which we suffer will pass away; and if with some of them we must bear still, they will be easier to bear.

Thirdly, do we not need in our preaching to give far greater prominence to the fact that Jesus is the Christ? To English Christians to-day the word Christ is a name, and little more;

they have no idea of the depth of meaning which it contains. That Jesus is the Christ is the second great truth of the Gospel. We want to link the hopes of our people for a better world up with Him; to make them see that in the widest possible sense "in none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved" (Acts iv. 12). It is the Christ Who brings the kingdom, and Who is its Head and Centre in so far as it has come: and where there is not faith in Him and allegiance to Him, that kingdom cannot come. I do not think it would be true to say of any section of the Church of England that their religion does not centre round our Lord. The Jesus of History, the life and teaching in which God was revealed, are far more real and vivid to us than they were to our grandparents; in all sections of the Church of England, though in ways very different one from another, there is even a danger that Jesus may become a substitute for God instead of being to us the way to the Father. But the strange thing is that the primary fact about Him with which we are concerned, the fact that Jesus is the Christ—the truth, belief in which makes us Christians—is often exactly the truth that we do not reach. We do not, in a word, grasp His relation to the kingdom; and so those who are devoted to our Lord as a personal Saviour find it possible to take little interest in the kingdom, and those whose great longing is for the establishment of the kingdom find it possible to take little interest in the Lord except as a teacher. May I explain my meaning a little more fully?

First, then, as we have already seen, the Christ is always the Saviour of the whole people of God, and as the Christ it is not as individuals that we are primarily concerned with Him. But that is what we forget. We are absorbed in what we can each gain from our Lord for ourselves, and have little interest in the Church or in the development of the rule of God within it; and so, in fact, we gain from our Lord much less than we might gain. Union with the Christ and union with the Church, as we may see more fully in our final lecture, are normally one and the same thing; and if the life of the Church is so impoverished that we gain little by belonging to it, we also gain little by belonging to the Christ.

But, secondly, we have to consider a different blunder. Is it not true that much noble effort is being thrown away because we are trying to build the kingdom of God for ourselves, instead of recognizing that it is the Christ Who alone can build it; and that if we are to co-operate with Him in building it, it can only be as His members? It is a great thing to have it recognized as widely as it is that the only principles that can save

civilization and the world are the principles of brotherhood and mutual service which our Lord taught us. But He did not cast these principles loose upon the world, or suppose that they could be taken one by one and applied to the life of the world as it is. No one had less belief in putting new patches upon old garments, or new wine into old bottles. He taught these principles to His followers, and it is only in those who are indeed His followers and His members that we can expect them to work. Of course, it may be quite possible to induce men to vote in favour of a supposed Christian programme if they understand it to mean that others are to be forced to benefit them, and it may be quite justifiable to do this. But action of that kind has little to do with the building of the kingdom of God. The kingdom, as we have seen, must come in the Church before there is any chance of its coming in the world, though we should not interpret the Church in too narrow a way. God has never yet sought to build His kingdom anywhere else. He began with a chosen people, and it was to that chosen people that our Lord proclaimed the kingdom. But even then He did not build it upon them all; He waited till there was faith in Himself as the Christ, till He had dug down and found the rock. It is this faith for which we must first work; it is useless to attempt to substitute philanthropy for it.

H. L. GOUDGE.

THE SERVANT POEMS IN THE DEUTERO-ISAIAH*

AND now for the Servant passages. I shall take it for granted that everyone accepts the all but unanimous judgment of modern scholars that the first sixteen chapters of the Deutero-Isaiah were written during the Babylonian exile. Exact precision in dating these ancient documents is to be deprecated unless the data are indubitably clear; but we may perhaps agree that some date near 540 best suits the references to the victorious career of Cyrus. I do not propose to rehearse all the arguments which militate against an Isaianic authorship of these chapters, nor will I detain you with an examination of the theory which would relegate them to the Maccabean age.

Now one very important point which we may have to decide before we come to a conclusion as to the most probable inter-

* The following study forms three lectures delivered to the Central Society of Sacred Study in Oxford on July 14-16, 1925. Much was necessarily left unsaid—*e.g.*, as to the historical situation, the earnest expectation of the coming kingdom, etc. But the object of the lectures was to serve as an indication of lines of study—not to present an exhaustive thesis.

pretation of the Servant poems is: Are chapters xl.-lv. the work of one author and do they cohere? And the most satisfactory way of clearing up these questions is to examine rapidly the principal doctrines of the writings. The book opens with a proclamation of glad tidings to Zion. Her exile and estrangement are ended, and the prophet hears one ordering that a way be prepared through the desert to facilitate the return of God's people. This same unseen agent (for so I understand the passage) orders the prophet to proclaim that all flesh is grass—a figure of transitoriness—and only the word of God abideth for ever. The verses in which this is enforced come between two proclamations of the coming joy of Jerusalem. There follows a long and fine poem on the almighty power of Jehovah, so great that the Lebanon and its beasts are inadequate for a burnt offering. Such a God can give of His Divine strength to His servants, so why does Jacob despair? Chapter xli. contains an address to the Gentiles. The prophet in Jehovah's name calls on them to explain the sudden rise of a world-conqueror whom the sequel shows to be Cyrus. Jehovah asserts that it is He Who has wrought this. While distant nations are in fear and trembling, Jehovah proclaims, "But thou, Israel, My servant, Jacob whom I have chosen . . . fear thou not." A poem in a different rhythm follows in which the annihilation of Israel's enemies is to be complete. (Unless this is an interpolation it is difficult to see how it is to be reconciled with the coming utterances, and more especially passages which presuppose the conversion of the nations.) Then comes a beautiful description of the miraculous amelioration of the tedious journey across the Syrian desert, followed by a fragment showing the futility of idol worship.

We now come to the first of the poems about the Servant of Jehovah at the beginning of chapter xlii. For the present I will summarize briefly its contents. The mission of the servant in whom Jehovah delights is to bring forth true religion (this is the meaning of the Hebrew *mishpat*) to the Gentiles. He will deal kindly with the feeble, and faithfully proclaim his religion. No discouragement will deter him, and he will finally establish the religion of Jehovah in the whole earth. The distant coastlands are even now waiting (or perhaps will wait?) for his direction.

A further oracle follows in another rhythm which seems to explain and expound the first poem. Jehovah announces that He has called and preserved His servant to be a covenant of the people, a light of the Gentiles in bringing out prisoners from the dungeon and opening blind eyes. There seems to be no very strong reason for coupling these metaphors with the return of the exiles. The following verse continues the polemic against

idols. There follows a joyous fragment of song, calling upon the Arabs of the Desert and the Sown to give praise to Jehovah. Jehovah has stirred Himself after His long quiescence, and proceeds to overthrow the settled condition of things: rivers become deserts; deserts become fertile settlements. The blind captives here who are to be led through the deserts are, no doubt, the exiles. A further polemic against idols.

In verses 18-25 we have another reference to the Servant of Jehovah in a most startling context. We have seen in verses 1-4 that he is to be successful in implanting the knowledge of Jehovah in the distant places of the earth by his gracious and untiring action. But here he is blind and deaf. There can be no doubt that the nation is meant, for the fact is underlined. Hear, *ye* deaf, not *thou* deaf! The servant hears without taking in the meaning of the words, sees without observing that Jehovah's purpose was to evangelize the world. The people are miserable captives, not reflecting that their plight was caused by their sin and apostasy. Israel does not reflect that its calamities are due to the wrath of Jehovah. The question has been raised, Can the personification of Israel in these two passages be the same, or can they have come from the same hand? Skinner thinks that the "solution of the difficulty lies in the distinction between the ideal calling of Israel to be realized in the future and its actual condition during the exile." In other words, the second passage, whether from the same or another hand, *is written in reference to the first.* If the first passage in xlii. 1-4 means Israel, it means an Israel that was never historic, a nation called to a great task which it did not attempt. This second passage points out the obvious, that the nation could not carry out its charge because it was in captivity for its sins. Hence we are driven back to the position—surely absurd—that the author of the first Servant poem commands his fellow-captives to carry their religion to the confines of the world. Unless we are prepared to date the poem post-exilic, it is obvious that some person or persons in the future is intended.

Chapter xliii. contains a message of comfort which, nevertheless, has much that is at variance with the theme of the Servant poems. Jehovah will protect His people, and the nations of Egypt and Ethiopia shall be enslaved in their stead by way of ransom. "I will give men for thee, and peoples for thy life." There is once more a startling contrast with the Servant poems. The wretched Gentiles are not the objects of the loving care and preaching of the Servant of Jehovah; they are to be cast as a prey to the conquering Cyrus. There is very little in the remark that Cyrus is receiving the territories on the Nile as an equivalent for the emancipation of the Jews, because Palestine

remained a Persian province so long as the Persians could hold it. The ransom is no territorial one, and the meaning is that the heavy hand of the conqueror is to be transferred from the Jews to the Gentiles. The exiles will return from the four winds of heaven, and all the Gentiles will be called upon to predict what is about to happen. Verse 10 again asserts the identity of the Servant and Israel. But here we keep in mind the difference in outlook and office. Here the Servant Israel is witness to the eternity of God and to what He is about to do—namely, put the Gentiles under the power of the Persian.

Verses 14-21 contain an announcement of the imminent fall of Babylon, and the return of the exiles, and Jehovah's forgiveness of sins, despite the absence of sacrifices in Babylonia. Israel has been punished because of its continual sin. Chapter xliv. is another exhortation to comfort, again calling Jacob "My servant" and Israel "whom I have chosen." Another polemic against idols. In xliv. 24 *f.* great prominence is given to Cyrus, who is called Jehovah's shepherd and Jehovah's Christ. Jehovah has raised him up and made his way clear before him; given to him the rulers of the earth for the sake of His servant Jacob. Though Cyrus has not known Jehovah, he will be the cause of all the world knowing that there is none other beside Jehovah. From xlv. 9 it would seem that some of the exiles resented the application of these honorifics to Cyrus. The prophet replies that the Lord who made heaven and earth knows best. He has determined on this method, and He must not be questioned. There follows the explicit statement that Cyrus will free the exiles and rebuild Jerusalem. And that, too, without any material inducement by way of bribe or recompense. Captives from Africa will make supplication to Israel (or to Cyrus?), and declare that only with them is God to be found. Another attack on idolatry. The survivors of the nations are now invited to draw near, turn unto Jehovah, and be saved. "Unto Me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." Here we may notice that while the universal conversion of the Gentiles to the faith of Jehovah is contemplated, it is only after a world-wide judgment, whether by the hand of Cyrus, or some direct act of Jehovah: survivors of the nations are addressed. Chapters xlvi.-xlvii. are concerned with the downfall of Babylon and the deliverance of Israel, and xlviii. is practically a summary of the principal themes already dealt with.

We now come to another division. Many of the themes hitherto discussed disappear finally. The polemic against idols, the advent of Cyrus, and the conquest of Babylon are left behind, and the writer is concerned with the glorious future of Israel. This is viewed under two different aspects: one through

the person of the Servant of Jehovah, and another through the personified Zion decked in the glorious raiment of a royal bride.

The servant calls upon the peoples of the earth to listen to him, and tells them that from his birth Jehovah had marked him out as His servant in whom to glorify Himself. The servant confesses that his labour has been fruitless, and that he has spent his strength for nought, whereupon Jehovah replies that to bring back Israel to Him is a small thing; he must also be a light to the Gentiles, that His salvation may be to the ends of the earth. Evidently, then, the mission on which the servant had spent his strength with so little result was the task of bringing back Israel to Jehovah. The point has often been made that Israel could not possibly have the task of bringing Israel back to God, and that a part of the nation must be meant, or an idealized part. We shall return to this conception later.

We noticed that the first Servant passage seemed to be the text on which someone had constructed an explanatory poem. So here the Deutero-Isaiah, or someone in full sympathy with his ideas and phraseology, explains what he thinks is meant. A significant fact is that the fourth Servant passage seems to be present also in the writer's mind. Jehovah addresses Himself to the servant despised and abhorred of a Gentile people, the servant of rulers, and tells him that kings and princes shall rise and do him homage because of Jehovah Who has chosen him.

There is then woven into the scheme the idea of the restoration and recolonization of Palestine, and the miraculously easy journey through the desert. Zion is incredulous of her approaching splendour, and is told that her old borders will no longer contain the throng of returning colonists eager to live in the Holy City. Kings of the Gentiles will be glad to take upon themselves menial offices, and will lick the dust of their feet. Israel's enemies shall be drunk with their own blood and feel the full weight of Jehovah's anger. Once again the contrast in feeling is marked.

In l. 4 we have the third Servant poem again introduced abruptly. "The Lord hath given me the tongue of disciples, to know when to speak" (so LXX and the probable Hebrew text). Jehovah has given him a secret message, so that he is not afraid to suffer insult and torture. He has set his face as a flint. All his enemies will wax old as a garment. Once more there follows the practical application of this. Israel is counselled to follow the example of this servant, trusting in the name of his God. It will be noted that the personal character of the servant is much more strongly marked here. His mission here is primarily that of a preacher who suffers for the truth.

In li. Israel is exhorted to consider its origin, and take com-

fort from the thought of all God's former promises and blessings. The universal character of Jehovah's religion is again emphasized. The very heavens will be shattered, but Jehovah's salvation and righteousness is eternal. Inasmuch as God is eternal, let not the people be dismayed at things temporal. The desolate condition of Jerusalem is portrayed under the figure of a prostrate drunken woman in order to bring into higher relief her coming exaltation. Even now are the feet of the evangelists of good tidings upon the Judean mountains.

At lii. 13 begins the last and greatest of the Servant poems, the Man of Sorrows, whose sufferings are apparent to all, but whose exaltation lies in the future. It will be convenient to postpone the consideration of this for the present. This poem, unlike its predecessors, is not taken up and dwelt upon in the sequel. Once more we have repetitions of comfort and promises of unprecedented temporal prosperity amid the confusion of Israel's enemies. If there is any reference to the servant, it is in the words, "*All* thy children shall be disciples of Jehovah."

Chapter lv. is a worthy sequel in character, if not in thought. Individuals are invited to enter into the new covenant with Jehovah without money and without price, save obedience. Nations will run to Israel because of the Lord their God. As surely as the rain comes down from heaven and fertilizes the soil, so surely the word of the Lord which has gone forth will accomplish its beneficent purpose. The Deutero-Isaiah closes with a short prophecy of the exodus from Babylon and the miraculous afforestation of the desert.

And now let us see what conclusions this rapid survey of these chapters has led us to. Two facts seem to stand out with uncompromising clearness: (1) The unity of thought is broken up by faulty arrangement of the material (if the arrangement of the Quran be a valid analogy, we may be sure that it was left to ardent disciples with more zeal for completeness than knowledge of arrangement to compile a prophet's writings); (2) the Servant poems must be earlier than some, if not all, of the Deutero-Isaiah, because they are themselves the subject of a commentary in the book. Further, we notice that some aspirations of the Deutero-Isaiah or another writer are in sharp contrast to the compassionate solicitude of the Servant.

If my first conclusion is sound, it follows that the book has been edited; and the contradiction in doctrine and the totally different outlook on the nations strengthens the supposition that the Deutero-Isaiah is not the author of the Servant passages. It is incredible that the writer who contemplated the Servant of Jehovah preaching and converting the heathen world eagerly awaiting his coming could have written of their kings and queens

licking the dust of the feet of the Jews or lying dead in their thousands on the field of battle with victorious Israel. The two conceptions are incompatible. Those scholars, then, who insist upon isolating the Servant poems are not wrong. As we have seen, they are not entirely alien to the spirit of the Deutero-Isaiah, who himself contemplates a universal conversion to Israel's God; but they belong to a religious genius whose conception of God's purpose transcends all his predecessors, and, we may add, all his successors, in the goodly fellowship of the prophets.

Before I ask you to subject the poems to a detailed examination, I should like to quote the words of a medieval Rabbi on Isa. liii. given by Driver and Neubauer, ii., p. 138: "I have never in my life either seen or heard of the exposition of a clear or fluent commentator in which my own judgment or that of others who have pondered on the same subject might completely acquiesce." This opinion has evidently been shared by all subsequent writers on this difficult subject. While these lectures were being written a new German treatise was published; and yet another book is advertised as forthcoming by the Oxford University Press. It is well to mention these facts, because the ordinary Churchman who has not the time or the special knowledge necessary for an independent examination of a problem of this kind is apt to feel a distaste for the whole subject and exclaim, "If professional Old Testament scholars cannot make up their minds, it is no use my trying to read the subject." One of the principal objects of our Society is to break down this attitude, and cultivate an intelligent criticism of critics and a strong devotional life of the intellect.

Stated in the crudest terms, interpretations of this Servant of Jehovah centre round a nation or an individual. The many difficulties inherent in either interpretation have been met by suggesting an ideal, or spiritual, or a scribal section of Israel for the one theory; or some such person as Jeremiah or Ezekiel, King Jehoiachin, an anonymous martyr, or the coming Messiah for the other. A bold attempt to reconcile the national and individual applications is familiar to all in Sir George Adam Smith's *Isaiah;* and there is a good deal to be said in favour of the theory there advocated, although it still leaves us with one of the principal objections that have been urged against a Messianic interpretation.

One highly significant fact meets us at the very outset. The first line of the first Servant poem in the LXX has the addition of the words "Jacob" and "Israel," thus identifying the servant with the nation. Rhythm alone is sufficient to condemn these additions as glosses, but they are of interest as showing how the passage was understood by the Jews of Alex-

andria. This first passage is neutral; it points to no conclusion. The servant has been sustained, chosen, and inspired by God. He does not proclaim his message by loud or violent preaching, but by gentle persuasiveness. Untiringly he pursues his course until the whole earth has accepted the religion he brings. In this poem God calls upon the world to take note of His servant and to mark his character. In the second (xlix. 1-6) the servant begins his address to the nations immediately after receiving the Divine commission. From his birth Jehovah has ordained him as His servant, endowing him with penetrating words which cut through pretence and opposition. Verse 3 is the *only* place in these four poems where the servant is identified with Israel, and in my opinion erroneously. It is true that only one Hebrew and one Greek MS. omit the word "Israel," but in spite of the verdict of those commentators who support the national conception of the servant I regard the word as a gloss. We have already seen how the LXX has interpolated the first poem, and nothing could be easier than for a scribe who constantly found "servant" followed by "Israel" in the Deutero-Isaiah (but *not* in the Servant poems) to insert the crucial word here. Whatever be the importance of the word, it is almost impossible to believe that if the nation of Israel were intended, this brilliant writer would choose to assert the fact in just the one place where he demonstrates its absurdity. For but two verses further on he writes, "And now, saith Jehovah, Who formed me from the womb to be His servant, to bring Jacob again to Him, and that *Israel* be gathered unto Him." If it may not be affirmed that it is impossible that the nation in some aspect was intended by the prophet, it must be allowed that he did not say Israel was called from birth to restore Israel to Jehovah! However, this position has been turned by the champions of the national theory, who suppose that Jehovah is the subject of the verb "to bring back." This is grammatiaclly possible, though a somewhat cumbrous clause results. But what is the meaning? According to Peake,* "the reference is surely to the same event as in verse 6 —*i.e.*, the restoration from exile." But this goes only half-way towards clearing up the difficulty. Can the poet really mean that the servant had been predestined from birth in order that Jehovah might bring back Jacob to Himself? Jehovah found the task too easy, so only then does He find a rôle for His faithful servant? Moreover, this theory requires the excision of the very words which connect the servant's prenatal consecration with Jehovah's subsequent confirmation thereof.

The exegesis of this second poem has been dominated by the underlying conviction of some commentators that verses

* P. 47.

5 and 6 refer to the restoration from exile, "to bring Jacob again to Him, and that Israel be gathered unto Him," and "to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel." But there is no need whatever to read this meaning into the words, and there are grave difficulties attaching to such an interpretation. One thing on which all are agreed is that Jehovah's servant has a message for the whole earth, and that the writer of these poems and the Deutero-Isaiah himself write under the burning conviction that Jehovah is the God of the whole earth. How unlikely and all but impossible it is that either of these writers should return to the antiquated and discredited superstition that Jehovah is only to be worshipped in His own land, which must follow from the interpretation of "bringing back Jacob to Him" as bringing Jacob back to Palestine, as though Jehovah were only to be found there. As we have seen, these poems are embedded in a number of prophecies of Israel's restoration from exile, and it has been assumed—though not demonstrated—that this must be the meaning of the prophet's words here. But the Hebrew words are just as colourless as the R.V. text, and by no means require such a narrow interpretation. There is no mention elsewhere in these poems of the Restoration; in fact, only the spiritual kingdom of God is contemplated. This is one of those amazing correspondences between the mind of the Servant and the mind of Christ. He contemplated a kingdom of God made without hands, without an empire, without anything save the Divine message He died to bring. Once these poems are detached from the Deutero-Isaiah, it becomes clear that their thought is only spiritual restoration of Israel to God. We may ask if the possible, though unnatural, translation of these verses would ever have been suggested had it not been necessary in the interest of the national theory to postulate another agent than the servant, who could only be Jehovah Himself? But what, I think, most strongly supports our view of these verses is the course of the dialogue between the servant and Jehovah. The servant calls on the world to take notice of his Divine commission and incisive speech. After Jehovah has hailed him as His servant he confesses that he has spent his strength for nought. On what? As the text stands the answer is plain. He has been formed from the womb to restore Israel to its unique relationship to Jehovah. The "And now" (וְעַתָּה) of verse 5 (resumed by ויאמר in verse 6) mark the new situation arising out of his fruitless labours to arouse Israel to a realization of his responsibilities. The servant confides his case as against Israel to the justice of God. And God replies, "It is too light for thy being My servant that thou shouldest raise up the tribes of Jacob and restore

the preserved of Israel: so I will make thee a light of the Gentiles that My salvation may be to the end of the earth."

Although the full national theory must go by the board if the foregoing arguments be valid, there still remains the theory of the ideal Israel. And if this poem stood alone it would doubtless hold its own. Inasmuch as the spiritual ideals of Israel were enshrined in the hearts and lives of the prophets, the servant would be a personification of the glorious company of the Hebrew prophets. There is much that is singularly attractive in this idea of an unknown prophet in the exile looking back on the sad and melancholy fate of most of Israel's inspired teachers—men filled with the Divine message which they spent their lives in vain efforts to deliver to the nation at large. But it has seemed inadequate to many writers as an explanation of the fourth poem.

The *third* poem (l. 4-9) carries us a stage further in the life-story of the servant. He tells how, despite an eloquent and instructed tongue, his mission was an outward failure. He was scourged, insulted, and spat upon, but yet he persevered. Conscious of the ever-present help of God, he defies his adversaries before God's court, and declares that they will pass away like other transient phenomena.

The servant is not mentioned by name in this fragment, but both language and thought make it plain that this is one of the cycle of poems. The story unfolded here lies midway between the second and fourth poems. If we only knew what had happened in this interval, the riddle of the servant passages would disappear for ever. Did the prophet write of a mission to his countrymen ending like all its predecessors in the outward shame and confusion of the prophet? Did he announce to his people his impending mission to the Gentiles? What was the cause of the hostility and hatred he excited? These are questions which can never be answered; the enormous literature which has grown up really aims at suggesting replies. As Skinner* has so well said: "The most fundamental contrast between rival interpretations of the servant idea is not that between *collective* and *individual* theories, but between *historical* and *ideal*—*i.e.*, between those which seek the root and origin of the conception in the sphere of phenomenal reality, and those which place it in the region of *noumena*—things ideal, not seen as yet.

The servant is in line with the great prophets in claiming that his message comes from God. He has the tongue of men carefully taught as disciples—that is to say, he has got his message by heart. The words, "That I should know how to sustain with words him that is weary: he wakeneth morning by morning"

* P. 265.

are certainly corrupt. The simplest change would be to read לְעִתּוֹ for לְעִית (an untranslatable word), "That I should know the (right) word in its season." This is the text implied by the LXX, who had no word corresponding to "weary." The remaining words are most probably due to dittography. The effect of obeying the voice of Jehovah was scourging and (as will appear) death. The servant, most eminently a person of refinement, lost even the consolation of dignity in his persecution.

His oppressors behaved like street Arabs, making him an object of scorn and contempt to any respectable Israelite of his time. But he endured with fortitude, because God helped him. He felt no shame. He was able to endure, because he knew that he would not be put to shame. He summons his opponents to come into God's presence and justify their ways, for he knows what God's verdict will be. He ends his defiance, "Lo, all of them shall wear out like a garment; the moth shall eat them up." The metaphor is a fairly common one, but it is nevertheless remarkable here. Of what use is it to the servant if his enemies wear out from age or use, unless he is conscious that he (or perhaps his lifework) will live on? In li. 6-8 we have the same metaphor to express the transience of heaven and earth as opposed to the eternal stability of God's salvation and righteousness. When the servant affirms that Jehovah helps him, none can put him in the wrong, and that all his adversaries will wear out like clothes, is he not making claims stronger than any predecessor has dared to make?

Here, at any rate, the theory of an ideal Israel begins to wear thin, and thus it has been inferred by some that the poet has transferred to the picture of the servant the actual experience of some prophet-martyr—*e.g.*, Jeremiah.

ALFRED GUILLAUME.

(To be continued.)

MAGIC AND SACRAMENTS*

"It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy" (Rom. ix. 16).

I

HEREIN is the secret of godliness, as learnt and published by the saints whose memory we venerate to-day. The secret is a simple one—that the only hope for man, as of salvation, so

* A sermon preached before the University of Oxford on Sunday, November 1 (All Saints' Day), 1925.

of the righteousness which attains salvation, lies in the grace of God, the vanity of human effort being only too apparent. The doctrine of the grace of God—of grace abounding to the worst of sinners—freely given, often where men have made no conscious effort to attain it, given without consideration of merit to those who at best must always remain unprofitable servants, and operative, when once given, in sanctifying the lives which it has apprehended—that is the doctrine embodied in our text. It is a doctrine not without its problems and mysteries, and to some of these we must return; it is, nevertheless, the doctrine above all others which we associate with every great revival of the ethical and religious spirit of Christianity. It is not of any one branch or sect or period of Christianity. Marcion inherited it as directly from St. Paul as did Tertullian; Luther and Calvin were, in this matter, as truly in the line of descent from Augustine as the Schoolmen, though the Reformers preferred to speak of "faith, the divine work within us,"* rather than use the medieval term of "grace." St. Bernard proclaimed the truth with no uncertain voice, but it was Abelard, his great antagonist, who endorsed it with the immortal words, "abyssus multa Dei judicia sunt!"

Of recent years, however, this doctrine of God's prevenient grace has become the focus of much serious and thoughtful-minded criticism. One great English theologian, to whose method and teaching we of the younger generation owe a great debt of gratitude, standing in this pulpit only a few years ago, said of the developed sacramentalism of the Middle Ages that it embodied a doctrine of grace conceived as a "mysterious influence which acts in a semi-physical manner through wholly physical channels. No doubt," he added, "a certain interior disposition is required . . . good works are insisted upon . . . but the performance of penance and conformity to ecclesiastical regulations are the good works generally contemplated"†—not, that is to say, purity of heart, uprightness of life, unselfishness of behaviour. Another, preaching only a month or two ago in an even more famous pulpit, put the case more forcibly still: "As Christianity became Catholicized," he said, "it took over from the mystery faiths most of their magic sacramentalism. Religion became contaminated by magic; the spiritual degraded to the mechanical. . . . The priest . . . could by correctness of

* Luther, *Ep. ad Rom. præf.* This "divine work" "changes us, makes us to be born again, destroys the old Adam, transforms us into other men, in heart, in feeling, in every faculty, and communicates to us the Holy Spirit." *Cp.* W. Hermann, *Communion with God*, 234-237, and passages there quoted. Calvin similarly asserted the coherence and conjunction of justification and sanctification as the result of faith (*Antidot. in Conc. Trid.*, 702).

† H. Rashdall, *Idea of Atonement* (*Bampton Lectures*), p. 351; *cp.* p. 390.

ritual, action, and words, endue inanimate matter with a spiritual character. This spiritual character could be transferred to the worshipper, prepared by priestly absolution, who then, and only then, found salvation. The sacraments worked by magic, or, in more polite phrase, *ex opere operato*. There is no reason to think that God works in such a way. The belief that He does so has no warrant in the teaching of Christ."*

It is not always recognized that what is here brought into question is not so much the doctrine of the sacraments as the more fundamental doctrine of grace itself. The sting of the criticism lies not in the words "physical means," but in the words "semi-physical manner." So much, I trust, will become clear as we proceed. Reasons for this failure to recognize the real issue involved are not far to seek. The doctrine of grace has in the past taken two forms—the sacramental and the non-sacramental. In the former, justification and sanctification are bound up with a double gift of God—the gift of faith and the gift of the sacraments; in the latter (the creation of the Continental reformers), they are bound up with a single gift alone—the gift of faith. But it is in its sacramental form alone that the doctrine of grace is questioned to-day. It is not, indeed, that this sacramental form is less ethical in results than its non-sacramental counterpart; Dr. Rashdall, from whom our first quotation was drawn, spoke in emphatic tones of the "decline in good works" which, on Luther's own testimony, "actually resulted from that doctrine which Luther identified with the gospel."† Another cause is at work. Recent developments of the comparative study of religions, both among peoples of the lower culture and in the pagan background of early Christianity, have brought to light a host of customs, rituals, and beliefs which, by the striking though often debased parallels they appear to offer to the sacraments of Christianity, suggest at first sight that here—in the sacraments themselves rather than in the doctrine of grace that lies behind them—is something alien to the genius of our religion. Among such parallels, it is true, is the great group of Hermetic literature, in which a "semi-physical" doctrine of Divine assistance appears without any associated ritual; and here might have been a starting-point for anyone who wished to show the pagan affinities of the non-sacramental doctrine of grace. Such an attempt, however, has never yet been initiated, and that for a further reason. Non-sacramental Christianity is wholly a product of the Reformation, and among its modern adherents the Pauline and Augustinian conception of grace

* Bishop of Birmingham's sermon in Westminster Abbey, reported in *The Times*, June 15, 1925; *cp.* also his sermon to the British Medical Association at Bath Abbey, *The Times*, July 22.

† *Op. cit.*, p. 417.

seems almost wholly to have died out; the distinctive doctrines of the Reformers in this matter have to-day few supporters.* The modern inquirer, therefore, finds the traditional doctrine of grace embodied only in its sacramental form. He is apt to think that this is the only form which it can assume; and he combines in one breath comparatively trivial strictures upon the sacraments with supremely grave ones upon the prior doctrine of grace. Impartial reinvestigation must distinguish between the two, and address itself mainly to the analysis of the idea of grace. If the tradition of Christendom on this point be endorsed, a coherent doctrine of the sacraments can easily be built upon its foundation; if the doctrine of grace, as we have stated it, is found to be untrue, the traditional conception of the sacraments must fall in the common ruin.

Time does not allow of our reopening once again the purely historical question, raised by some of the critics, as to the interrelation between the thought and practice of the early Church and that of the mystery cults. Indeed, this question does not affect the main issue; it would be no shame to the Church to have "borrowed" from alien sources, if what was "borrowed" was homogeneous with what was held by legitimate inheritance. Nor need we labour to pillory, to vindicate, or even to excuse, every foolish or superstitious sentence which might be quoted from the minor writings of the Middle Ages or the popular religious expositions of the present day. We will not even hesitate (as some writers do) to admit that there may be general affinities between Christian sacramentalism and the "magical" thought which, with varying degrees of cogency, is alleged to dominate the rites of uncivilized races and the pagan cults of Hellenistic times.† The problem at issue in its widest form is simply this: granted that such affinities exist and must be recognized, how far is it true, in the words of the second preacher I have quoted, that "we have no reason to think that God works in such a way"? May it not be possible that there are, even in the most debased magical rites, elements of truth about the relation of God to man; and that these elements are precisely those which, in a form so purified as at last to compel our acceptance, stand out as the salient characteristics of the doctrine of sacramental grace?

II

What, then, are the *gravamina* against the idea of grace embodied in the sacraments? At what points is its resemblance to magic alleged? It is not urged that men have recourse to the sacraments for evil and antisocial ends, though to many students

* So also Rashdall, *op. cit.*, 420.

† See *infra*, Note A, "The Idea of Grace in the Mystery Religions."

this more than anything else is the feature which distinguishes magic from religion.* It is not urged that men have recourse to them for purely temporal benefits, or for a merely sensuous emotional quickening; it is not specially urged even that there are some who receive the sacraments in the mere hope of a salvation independent of all moral characteristics. Abuses of the sacraments such as these are not, indeed, unknown to us; but they are abuses which may affect equally every other Christian practice and system—the practice of prayer, private, public, and silent alike; the system of Quietism; the Wesleyan class-meeting of older days; the Salvationist revival; the doctrine of justification by faith. It was not a Catholic sacramentalist who gave the advice, *Pecca fortiter*.

If we take the weighty passages I have already quoted as our guide, we shall find that the indictment against the traditional doctrine of the sacraments lies under three main heads: that it thinks of grace as a semi-physical force; that it conceives it as attached to, inherent in, physical means—Holy Persons, Places, Actions, Words, or Times; and that it regards the due provision of these means as the only conditions necessary for the transmission of grace, compared with which the moral state of the worshipper is indifferent. It is not the supposed *effect* of grace, therefore, which is under criticism; in a culture such as our own all must agree to look for its effects solely in the moral sphere, however narrowly that sphere may be conceived. The flail rises to fall only upon our conception of the *nature*, the *conditions*, and the *means* of grace. Its *nature*, we are told, we conceive physically, not spiritually, thus involving ourselves in an impossible confusion of thought; its *conditions* formally, not ethically; its *means* irrationally, and not rationally—and all this together makes our conception magical and not religious, causing the Christian to stumble and those without to blaspheme. "There is no reason to think," it is urged, "that God works in such ways"; He cannot, will not, does not influence man for good by methods such as these.

By what tests may we assess the justice of a condemnation so sweeping and inclusive? We must not appeal to our own experience in religion; that may be wholly warped by "magical" categories to which our thought has been inured. Nor may we appeal to Scripture; for Scripture, we shall be told, except perhaps for such sentences of the Gospel as are allowed to stand for authentic sayings of the Lord, is riddled through and through with just those "magical" conceptions which it is the business of the modern theologian to eliminate. Scripture, then, and personal experience of God and grace, being alike ruled out as

* So, *e.g.*, W. Robertson Smith, *Religion of Semites*,[2] 263 *f*.

evidence for the methods by which God influences man for good, we have only one other direction in which to look. Let us consider the influence which a good or great man has upon his neighbours in the ordinary intercourse of life, and ask the question: Does it at once and for ever rule out the conception that moral goodness passes from one being to another, as by a semi-physical force, without necessary moral conditions on the part of the recipient, and by physical or automatic means ?

The tyranny of phrases is all the greater in proportion as their plausibility obscures the need for inquiry into their meaning. It is so with this soubriquet of "semi-physical," which, like a vampire, threatens to suck the life out of the Christian doctrine of grace. English theology, however, shows its poverty by having only one or two such phrases;* the Germans use a round dozen for the same conception, and ring the changes on a "physical-hyperphysical" or "superterrestrial-material substance," "element," "fluidum," "göttliches Kraftstoff," "contagium," and the like.† The synonyms give the content of the idea aptly enough, and it is clear that it applies as much to the non-sacramental as to the sacramental variant of the doctrine. Grace (it is alleged) is thought of as something akin to the air which fills a man's lungs; the wind on the heath which uplifts his spirits; the liquor which intoxicates and exuberates him; the music which takes him out of himself; the drug which soothes his nerves; the infection which steals into his veins from contact with disease. That such a conception (whether "magical" or no) is not unscriptural is beyond dispute, though it is attached in the Bible, not so much to the idea of "grace," which still retains its earlier and less subtle meaning of the "kindly favour" of God, as to the idea of the Holy Spirit. In Greek and Hebrew alike the Spirit is spoken of by the very word which stands for "breath";‡ the Fourth Gospel compares His operations to the wind blowing where it listeth;§ His manifestations in the Old Testament are akin to the ravings of lunacy;‖ and in the New may be mistaken for drunkenness;¶ to receive Him (even in His most ethical operations) is spoken of in physical metaphors—drinking the Spirit, being filled with the Spirit, being led by the Spirit, being driven, quickened,

* Honourable mention should be given to the term "spiritual osmosis" recently coined by Mr. T. H. Stribling the novelist (*The Birthright*, 95).

† W. Heitmüller, *Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus*, 20; R. Kabisch, quoted Stevens, *New Testament Theology*, p. 444; H. Gunkel, *Wirkungen des Heiligen Geistes*, 20, 21, 29, 43 (against Wendt); P. Volz, *Geist Gottes*, 23; W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 110; F. Loofs, *Leitfaden*, 164; J. Weiss, *Urchristentum*, 327, 373. For a wise appreciation of the extent of this conception in New Testament Christianity, J. Lebreton, *Origines du Dogme de la Trinité*, 348 *ff.*, 401.

‡ *Ruach, pneuma.*

§ John iii. 8. ‖ 1 Sam. xix. 24. ¶ Acts ii. 13.

carried along by the Spirit.* There can be little question that the Spirit in these passages—or "grace" in the later terminology of the Church—is thought of exactly as some such tenuous, subtle, imperceptible force, operating upon human nature even against its will.

True, there is a difference. Even the most radical critic will admit that in all but the lowest stages of Biblical and theological thought the Spirit or grace of God is conceived of as having a moralizing result—as making a man ethically more righteous, more like the pattern of Christ. The analogous forces of wind and drug and stimulant, on the other hand, effect as a rule no more than physiological or nervous changes, though even here we must remember that in the strange chemistry of God's universe physiological and nervous changes are not without their psychological concomitants. But this difference of result in the two cases, whether it be great or small, has no relevance to the argument. What is criticized, as we have seen, is not the supposed *result*, but the supposed *mode of operation* of grace. We may for our convenience discard the cumbrous phrase "semi-physical," and, adopting a medical metaphor, speak of a "tonic" conception of grace. If, in conformity with the tradition we have just reviewed, the Spirit or grace of God is thought of as seizing upon a man's will—enabling, purifying, directing, transforming it—as the physician's tonic seizes upon his bodily system and reinvigorates it, then, it is alleged, the thought embodies a doctrine fundamentally irrational, unethical and un-Christian. It is not in such ways that God chooses to influence men for good.

Let us apply our chosen test: the influence which one outstanding personality has upon his fellows. Does it not suggest that there may be truth, after all, in this conception of God's working? Have you no friend whose personality acts upon you in just this "tonic" way? Has no painter, writer, singer, preacher, ever lifted you out of yourself and given you new heart and courage by an influence altogether analogous? It is not that you reason upon what he says or attempts to convey by his art (nay, he may have said and attempted nothing at all); not that you consciously argue with yourself, "Because of such and such a message or example thus given to me, I will shake off sloth and depression and be a new man." The influence is more direct, impersonal, inexplicable than that. It is the effect of personality impinging directly upon personality; of the more vital pouring itself out into the less vital; of the completely harmonized giving tone to disharmony. But the fact that

* Rom. xii. 13; Eph. v. 18; Rom. viii. 14; Mark i. 12; Rom. viii. 11; Acts xv. 29 Cod. Bez.).

it is an influence of spirit upon spirit does not make its mode of operation any the less "semi-physical," if this latter phrase has any meaning at all. The analogy of the tonic or the stimulant is the only analogy that expresses it; and we admit the fact when, in common language, we say that the friend or the song or the picture or the poem stimulates, intoxicates, exhilarates us; when we call the personality which influences us magical or infectious or magnetic.* There are other ways in which men influence one another, no doubt—by explicit advice, for instance, by reproof and by example; but this way at least is known to all of us, and as to its potency there can be no disagreement. Granted a personality sufficiently distinct and compelling, the effect may even be produced without local contact. A mere memory is enough; it may even be the case that one man's thought and will can move and affect another's at a distance, whilst both remain wholly unconscious that any influence is at work.

Why, it may be asked, should the phrase "semi-physical" ever have been attached to an operation of this kind, if in truth it be so entirely human in quality? Two reasons suggest themselves. The physical world—the wind, the stimulant, the drug—is wholly unconscious of any influence it brings to bear upon the body or mind of man, nor does it intentionally exert that influence. And men themselves are in this matter most often akin to material things. The influence of personality upon personality can rarely be controlled, is often altogether unrealized, by the agent; it radiates from him as heat from a fire, as light from a lamp. Indeed, to depend upon personal magnetism is only to covet failure. The singer must concentrate upon technique and execution, the saint upon his duties, to the exclusion of any conscious attempt to dominate personality by personality, if his influence is to have its full effect. By some strange paradox which passes our understanding, it is only as we make ourselves like *things* in this respect that we can exert our highest powers as *persons*. That, it may be thought, is one reason; a second may be found, once again, in the realm of comparative anthropology. Primitive man, we are told, takes his first step in the direction both of magic and of religion when he endows a rock or tree or stream not merely with the characteristics proper to its genus, but also with spiritual powers embryonically analogous to grace; and some students, though not all,† will have it that behind this *Mana* theory lies no latent thought of any personality animating the fetish. But however these things may be, it is

* *Cp.* Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, vii. 7, 35; and see *infra*, Note B, "The Phrase 'Semi-Physical Force.'"

† See, *e.g.*, R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, p. 119.

clear that man exercises upon his neighbour a tonic force which, though it may with some justice be called "semi-physical," is none the less supremely human; and though it is best exercised impersonally, may, for that very reason, be all the more ethical in effect.

If, therefore, the Christian postulates an activity of the same "tonic" kind of the grace of God, he has no cause to be ashamed; it is absurd to think that he is transferring the crude *Mana* theory of primitive magic and religion to the developed sphere of an otherwise reasonable theology. The very least that is true is that he postulates of God a power and willingness to influence man akin to that by which man influences his fellows; that he applies to this branch of Christian thought the time-honoured principle of the analogy of religion "to the constitution and course of nature"; and that he adds one more question to the pertinent inquiries of the Psalmist: "He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? He that made the eye, shall he not see?"*

III

This "tonic" influence of man upon man, of which we have been speaking, must no doubt fail of any lasting result unless the recipient bestir himself to employ, to the best of his ability, the new enthusiasm so mysteriously bestowed. Nor is it more than a truism to say that its initial effect will be most powerful where in the recipient there is already some degree of moral effort and earnestness to which it can appeal, and with which it can co-operate. And both these truths of human intercourse are true in equal measure of that traffic of God with man which we call the work of grace. How else could we account for the constant appeal for moral effort which is the burden of Old and New Testaments alike, and of all Christian preaching? But Scripture and theology assert with no uncertain voice a further dogma about the grace of God, considered in itself and apart from any question of its sacramental embodiment; and here, again, they introduce something which the critic at first sight pronounces without hesitation to be magical. They assert that, however desirable the co-operation of the will may be, grace may be both given and renewed even where the recipient has made no effort to attain to it; whilst any effort that he can make, however heroic, must still remain unworthy of the reward of Divine assistance. *Man cannot merit the first grace*,† and therefore nothing hinders that the first grace may be given where there has been no attempt to merit it. If we are to speak of the

* Ps. xciv. 9.

† Aquinas, *Sum. Theol.*, i. 2, q. 114, a. 5; *cp.* iii, q. 2, a. 11, in corp.

strictly minimum conditions upon which the grace of God is given or renewed, then in conformity with Biblical and Christian tradition we must say that the only *necessary* conditions are such as bring a man formally within the sphere of grace; the mercy of God is sufficient for the rest. This thought dominates the teaching of St. Paul, with his great condemnation of the law (conceived, be it remembered, as ceremonial and moral alike*) and his pointed antithesis between grace and works; dominates it to such an extent that (as theologians of every school of thought agree) on the strict surface logic of his system—a logic to which no doubt he himself continually gives the lie in practice—no Christian could avoid being made by grace a perfect Christian, irrespective of any efforts and earnestness of his own.† Here is a thought startling enough in all conscience, one sufficient in itself apparently to justify any charges of "magic" which may be brought against the Christian idea of grace. But, once again, our experience of the intercourse of man with man can teach us that even this conception may be true of the intercourse of man with God.

For when all has been said that can be said of the need for moral co-operation on the part of the recipient, even in human intercourse, it yet remains true that where such effort and earnestness are wholly lacking (in so far as they can be wholly lacking in any man formed in the image of God), we are still not outside the scope of influence of a brilliant, sympathetic, or saintly character. Though there is no more than a mere willingness to be influenced, a faith in the power of the other—be he friend, priest, artist, or what you will—to influence, there is some ground at least into which seed may fall and fructify. We can even go further. No one who has witnessed an orator dominate and bend to his purposes a hostile mob, no one who has known a musician rouse even an unsympathetic audience to enthusiasm and applause, will refuse to admit that the human personality, at its highest, can communicate the infection of its own ideals and vigour even to those reluctant so to be influenced. The earnest co-operation of the recipient is, beyond all question, the most favourable condition for the transmission of power and enthusiasm from man to man. A passive receptivity presents conditions less hopeful, but not by any means without hope. But even where these are replaced by grudging acquiescence or

* *Cp.* J. Denney in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, iii. 78; P. E. More, *Christ of the New Testament*, 209.

† So H. Rashdall, *Idea of Atonement*, 116; W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, 117 (n. 25), 119 (n. 31); H. Windisch, *Taufe und Sunde*, 104, 121, etc.; W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 118, 128; J. Weiss, *Urchristenthum*, 400, 401; P. E. More, *Christ of the New Testament*, 195 ff; C. H. Dodd, *Meaning of Paul for To-day*, 115, 121, etc.

active hostility, the heart can still be tamed and its resistance overcome. If so much be possible even to the flickering will of man, must not still more be possible to the indomitable love of God? And if it be possible, need we doubt the testimony of great souls of all ages—from St. Paul to John Bunyan, from St. Augustine to Francis Thompson—that in countless instances it has taken place and will take place again—the hound of heaven never fails to run down his chosen quarry? "Whither shall I go then from Thy Spirit?" cried the Psalmist; "or whither shall I go then from Thy presence? If I climb up into heaven, Thou art there; if I go down into hell, Thou art there also; if I take the wings of the morning and remain in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there also shall Thy hand lead me and Thy right hand shall hold me." "It is not of him that willeth nor of him that runneth"—whether his course take him towards or away from God—"but of God that showeth mercy."

Nothing, indeed—as Augustine saw from the very outset of his controversy with Pelagius—could be more disastrous than to deny this truth of the prevenience of God's grace to all human effort and merit. Say, if you please, that the co-operation of the will is necessary, once grace is given, for any real advance in holiness to be made; our analogies bear out the contention, and none but the most extreme predestinarians have ever denied it by more than an occasional exaggerated phrase, none but the most lax of missionaries, though they may have shrunk from the apparent paradox it involves,* have ever ignored it as the sole working basis of evangelism. But take just one step further, and assert that God's grace can only come to such men as earn it by preceding merit of faith or works, and you have denied all that makes Christianity a religion; you have reduced it to the level of a moral code, though the noblest of codes, no doubt. And that to Christian saintliness is almost the final blasphemy. That all man's progress should be traceable back, not to the sole mercy of God, but to an act or effort of his own unaided will, is the thought which Christendom has

* On the strict logic of the Pauline doctrine of grace, as we have seen, every Christian would have to be a perfect Christian in the end, whether he wished it or no. The same is true of Augustine, Luther, and perhaps Calvin (see Moehler, *Symbolism*, p. 98 n.). The logical necessity is evident; if the grace of God is strong enough to overcome the reluctance of the unregenerate, it must, *a fortiori*, be strong enough to overcome similar reluctance on the part of the regenerate; the latter *must* be less than the former, from the mere fact that sanctifying grace is already at work in the soul. The dilemma is not, perhaps, theologically insoluble, but the solution does not concern us here; for the Pelagian controversy really turned on another issue—how, namely, is the Christian preacher to deal with the unconverted or the lapsed? Pelagius said, in effect: "Urge him to moral effort, and God will co-operate if necessary"; Augustine replied, "That is the way of *law*, which has always proved a failure; tell him of the grace of God manifested in the love of Christ, and leave that grace to have its own effect."

rejected as inconceivable; that our salvation should depend, in the last resort, upon the tenuous chance of a righteousness of our own sufficient to lend congruity to a subsequent act of grace, puts salvation almost, if not altogether, beyond the reach of hope. There is no middle way here. The first mover in man's salvation must be either man or God, the first condition either works or grace; and "if grace, then no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace; but if works, then it is no more of grace, otherwise work is no more work."*

IV

So far we have considered only those two phases of criticism which attack the doctrine of grace in itself, irrespective of the form, sacramental or otherwise, in which it may be clothed. We come now to the third and last count in the indictment, which concerns the sacraments in particular. And as to this little need be said. It is beyond all question that this "tonic" influence exercised by man upon man—even in the face of the receiver's reluctance—can operate by physical means. The spoken or written word, the work of art, the musician's composition—all these, as our analogies show, are agencies commonly enough sanctified to such a purpose. No one not wholly blind to the intermingling of the physical with the spiritual could hesitate for a moment to admit this contention. It is, therefore, all the more difficult to understand the statement which sometimes meets us, that "material things cannot be endowed with spiritual power"—unless, indeed, by "spiritual power" is meant "a capacity for personal initiative in spiritual matters." In such a sense the statement would be true, no doubt, but irrelevant; for it has never been claimed that in the sacraments things are thus transformed into persons. What is more important to notice is that the influence is still possible, though the means employed—be it formula, token, or rite—is repeated time and time again. The Christmas or Easter greeting is no more than a formula, a kiss is no more than a repeated ritual; but when heart speaks to heart thereby, age does not wither nor custom stale them. A masterpiece of music never wearies the familiarized ear, and old-world buildings without change of form never cease to charm the eye; the sentimentalist will be thrilled as much on his thousandth moonlit night as on his first. "When this you see, remember me," expresses no idle aspiration for the ring of which it is the posy; and even the meaningless quips and pranks of a comedian will often gain, rather than lose, in their effect by judicious iteration.

* Rom. ix. 6. *Cp.* the important and outspoken passages in A. Robertson, *Regnum Dei*, 189, and John Oman, *Grace and Personality*, 24, 25.

If these things be so, we are forced to the conclusion that at all the points attacked the doctrine of sacramental grace is shown, by the analogies of human intercourse, to be beyond reproach. Man has a "tonic" or "quasi-physical" influence upon his fellow-man, which, though enhanced by the willing co-operation of the recipient, is not necessarily dependent thereupon; and nothing forbids that the repetition of a formula, token, or rite should be the means of its transmission. Some of the most intimate and sacred of our human experiences are characterized by just these three features; what hinders, then, that we should accept the testimony of the saints that just these features also distinguish their experience of God's grace? We shall not, indeed, make the mistake of asserting that because the moral co-operation of the recipient is not in every case essential to the activity of grace, therefore it is in any case dispensable. We have followed the saints in accepting the doctrine that all human righteousness arises, and can only arise, from the prevenient grace of God poured into the soul; we need not follow Augustine and Luther when they tread the lonely path which leads to the doctrines of irresistible grace, of predestination, and of the nothingness of the human will.* Indeed, by her doctrines of the necessity of intention in the minister of the sacrament† and of faith in the receiver (or his sponsors, if baptism be in question) the Church has for ever excluded such a misinterpretation of the indefectibility of Divine love. And if it be true that it is just these three points alleged which characterize the systems of modern superstition or ancient magic, then we must reply that in these points at least superstition and magic are proved to be rational and religious; they recognize, in however perverted a form, truths which lie at the very basis of all intercourse not only of man with man, but also of man with God.

V

Yet when all this has been said, I believe we shall still hesitate to accept our conclusion as it stands. There is something in magic which repels us, and it is something which has from time to time obtruded itself into the Christian doctrine of the sacraments. But it is not any of the matters to which we have been giving our attention, nor does it affect our conception of grace as such, but only a less than Christian view of the sacra-

* The actual phrase used by Augustine is not "irresistible," but "indeclinabiliter et insuperabiliter," *de corr. et grat.*, 12 (38). For Luther see Moehler, *Symbolism*, 89 *ff.*

† So even Augustine, who most of all prepared the way for the doctrine that "the unworthiness of the minister hindereth not the effect of the sacraments" (see C. H. Turner in Swete, *Church and Ministry*, p. 187), was not prepared to admit that without intention there could be a sacrament—*C. Don.*, vii. 53 (102).

ments which from time to time has been associated therewith. Our hesitations, if we think them out, will be found to centre round two points. It is these two points, and no others, against which I believe the critics intend, with some reason, to direct their attacks, though—as has happened with many another army—the complexities of the ground have misled their forces, and they have assailed traditional Christianity at points which we have found to be inviolable.

The first of the two points at which we shrink from any contact or analogy between magic and the sacraments is given for us by the word *meaningless*, which we used a moment ago in one of our illustrations. We hold that the charms, incantations, fetishes, and tokens of magic or superstition are meaningless, arbitrary, irrational; organically disconnected and remote from the spiritual quality thought to lie behind them. Such a conception conflicts with our ideal of a rational and organic universe. Yet we are aware that the same arbitrary character marks out the sacraments of the Church in some at least of the presentations which the doctrine has received. Men and women have been taught to approach the sacraments for no other reason than that the Church enjoins them, or that they were commanded in the last earthly utterances of the Lord; and enunciation of the formula by a competent minister, without thought either of its context or its content, has been represented as the only thing needful to validate the rite. Our second hesitation turns round the idea of *inevitability*, which often seems to link the sign with the thing signified—as in magic, so in sacramental doctrine; so that it would appear that the presence and grace of God can instantaneously be compelled by the mere repetition of rite or formula. Neither of these implications —neither that of " meaninglessness " nor that of inevitability—has any counterpart in those human analogies which have guided us hitherto; for though we spoke of the comedian's quip as " meaningless," we know only too well that a jest altogether without meaning—without relation to life—cannot evoke laughter, and that unless some sort of whimsical appositeness characterized even his most daring irrelevances, no trace of a smile would reward them. Can we, ought we, therefore, at these points to draw a distinction between sacraments and magic ?

It would seem that we both ought and can. On the second head, indeed, it is not difficult. We may admit an inevitableness of conjunction between sign and thing signified (and otherwise sacramentalism in any form would be impossible and absurd), but we need not regard the inevitableness as one of temporal concurrence, as though each repetition of the rite produced an

immediate and determined supply of grace, as surely as the magic lamp guaranteed the appearance of its attendant djinn. Once again the analogy of nature comes to our aid. There is an inevitable conjunction between the lightning and the thunder; yet the moments at which each strikes the observer's consciousness may be widely separated. A thousand years in God's sight are but as a day, and a day as a thousand years; the supra-temporal is not bound by time as we are. If we are content to hold that, though this or the other repetition of a rite may to all appearance fail to bring access of grace even to the earnest worshipper, loyal and continuous devotion to the sacraments cannot fail (in God's time, not in ours) of the expected result, we are holding all that man can expect, all that God has vouchsafed.

And on the other head our answer is no less obvious. Grant that the methods of magic are irrational—though even here we must remember that to the believer there is some reason in what he does. The fool who makes his prayer to a rag and a bone and a hank of hair will not transfer his worship to any alternative bone which may be offered him; he has a crazy logic of his own which endows *his* rag, *his* bone, with peculiar virtue.* That, however, is the most that can be said in his defence. The rationality of the sacraments, on the other hand, is beyond all cavil. We throw away our strongest weapon if we appeal to loyalty and blind obedience alone, and advocate reception simply on the grounds of an arbitrary command of the Church or an arbitrary institution even by Christ Himself; or if we allow the material causes of the sacrament—the priest, the elements, the words of consecration—to be spoken of as though they were the efficient and formal causes too.† We need not labour the point; a moment's consideration of the Eucharist will be enough. It is a solemn meal, and all the world over and in every type of society, loyalty, friendship, and mutual helpfulness are cemented and enhanced by corporate meals. It recalls the solemn meals of Christ and His disciples, the last meal of all He took with them before His death, His first breaking of bread after His resurrection, both of which world-shaking events it thus (if in no other way) brings to mind. It enshrines whatever truths (and there were many) underlay the sacrifices of earlier days; it reminds us of those two types of Christ's relationship to men—the Bread of Life and the Vine—in which we can scarcely doubt that the Fourth Evangelist is building upon words of the Lord Himself. Here is no isolated magic incantation; here is a rational rite

* On the rational element in magic see J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*², i. 62; F. Cumont, *Religions Orientales*, 273, 288; and contrast the curious remarks of Schweitzer on the non-rational character of the Pauline sacraments, *Paul and his Interpreters*, 213-215.

† See *infra*, Note C, "Irrational Expositions of Sacramental Doctrine."

embedded in a vast coherent context of the highest religious and ethical value. To the Christian, no other ceremony conceivable could stand in more organic relationship to the whole fibre of his reasonable faith; and no one who believes in God at all could shrink from admitting that the grace of God must surely rest, if anywhere, upon such a meal as this—rest upon it so as (in God's time, not in man's) to enter into the hearts of loyal participants and multiply and increase there; rest upon it so as not to leave altogether untouched even those whose participation is listless or bordering upon disloyalty.*

Our duty surely is clear. It is not through fear of possible magical affinities to deny to our sacramental intercourse with God characteristics which we admit fully enough of our ordinary intercourse with man—the passing from one to another of "tonic" influence which cannot fail to have *some* effect, however invisible for the time. It is rather to guard against the immoralism which, rampant in superstition and magic, may creep into every form of religion, sacramental and non-sacramental alike. It is, again, to substitute for the false idea of a mechanical and contemporaneous irresistibility of grace the true idea of a spiritual irresistibility achieving its fruition in God's own time. It is, above all, to emphasize and teach to the full the utter rationality of the Christian sacraments, to elicit the fundamental truths to which their simple forms bear witness, and so to draw at the right and not at the wrong point the line which separates religion from magic as surely as day is separated from night. So doing, we shall enhance our own faith and open the way for grace to penetrate more deeply into our hearts; so doing, we shall eliminate what is false without impugning what is true; so doing, we shall help forward the work of the Church in extending by her sacraments to all men that grace which makes them meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.

NOTES.

A. The Idea of "Grace" in the Mystery Religions.

It is at least allowable to suggest that there is really very little evidence that the "tonic" conception of a semi-physical supernatural force played any part in the mystery religions of the first century at all. The phenomena of "ecstasy" and "possession" (ἔνθεος εἶναι, ἐνθουσιασμὸς) were, of course, well known to the Greeks, especially in connection with the Pythian oracle and the Dionysiac orgies. But there is little to show that the primary purpose of the votaries even in the Dionysiac cult was to obtain supplies of a mysterious "life-force" either for its own sake, or (Farnell, *Cults of Greek States*, v. 163, against Rohde) "to work vegeta-

* See *infra*, Note D, "The Real Presence—'in' the Service or 'in' the Elements?"

tion magic"; the recognized formula used of the Mænad is simply that he "raved in honour of the god" (Farnell, *ibid.*, v. 153, 154, 158). It is universally agreed that the primary purpose of the mysteries was to provide a guarantee of immortality; and that the principal means by which the initiate received this guarantee were an *epopteia*—the witnessing of a dumb-show in which the god died and revived again (hence the mystery deities were all chthonian), or perhaps (as in Apul., *Metam.*, xi.; and *cp.* Plut. *ap.* Stob., quoted Farnell, iii. 356, Loisy, *Mystères Paiens*, etc., 63) the initiate himself rehearsed the passage of his soul through the "elements" (planetary cycles) after death, with or without the reception of a keyword which would enable him to pass the barrier of the planets (especially of Orphism, Farnell, iii. 193; Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion*, 128; Cumont, *Religions Orientales*, 187; and in general Cumont, 327, n. 37). To these were added, in different rites, lustrations of water or of blood, sacred meals, ritual marriage acts, and the like. Loisy (36, 110, 111, 119, etc.,), Reitzenstein (*Hell. Mysterienrel.*, 7*f.*, 13, 17, 20, 21, etc.), Bousset (*Kyrios Christos*, 114 *ff.*), Cumont (with less emphasis, 45, 102, 104, 148, 264, 309), and others, all assume practically without question that each or all of these ceremonies gave the initiate "mystic union" with the god, and some form of "supernatural power"; and the idea has passed practically without criticism into English writers—*e.g.*, K. Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 41 *f.*, 193-197; W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, 143, 145, 376; Angus, *Mystery Religions and Christianity*, 81*f.*, 95*f.*, 100, 110, 114, 129*f.*—G. Murray (*op. cit.*, 129-131), H. A. A. Kennedy (*St. Paul and Mystery Religions*, 86, 93, 206, 209, 228, 256, etc., and article "Mysteries (Christian)" in Hastings' *E.R.E.*, ix. 73 *ff.*), P. Gardner (article "Mysteries (Greek and Phrygian)," *E.R.E.*, ix. 79 *ff.*), and, above all, S. Dill (*Roman Society from Nero to the Antonines*, 544, 576), are more guarded. L. R. Farnell says of the Eleusinian mysteries no more than that they gave the votary "a friendly feeling" towards the god (iii. 197; contrast Loisy, 278), of Attis-worship, "some kind of mystic exaltation" (iii. 300), and only admits the idea of "supernatural energy" in connection with the Dionysus cult (v. 163). In particular he rejects the opinion that "partaking through food of the divine substance of the divinity" has any real place in Greek ritual (iii. 196), except in the omophagy of the Mænads, and here the passage on which he chiefly relies (Arnob., *Adv. Nat.*, v. 19; *cf.* Loisy, 33) is shown to have a different meaning by E. Bevan (C. Gore, *Holy Spirit in the Church*, 105-106), with whom, in substance, H. Rashdall (*Idea of Atonement*, 481) fully agrees.

Plutarch (*de Is. et Os.*, 27) shows quite clearly that the sole purpose of the mystery spectacle was symbolic encouragement of the depressed or doubtful, and an unprejudiced reading of the principal other relevant passages (Apul., *Met.*, xi.; Firmicus Maternus, *de err.*, 22; contrast Bousset, *K.C.*, 138; and, for the Taurobolium, Prudentius, *Peristeph.*, x. 1006 *ff.*, quoted Loisy, 118) wholly bears him out. (It is absurd of Loisy, without discussion, to dismiss Plutarch's testimony as "inexact and superficial.") The same conclusion results from the fact that the impression left in the votary's mind was not that of "union," but "I am become a votary of Attis" (Firm. Mat., *de err.*, 18, which Loisy, 109, again without argument, dismisses as "less than authentic"), or "I must serve the goddess" (Apul., *Met.*, xi. 15; *cf.* Reitzenstein, *Hell. Myst.*, 66 *ff.*, on the *sancta militia*). It is only by reading into first-century cults ideas from the

Egypt of the eighteenth century B.C. (stele of Ikharnofret (Schaeffer, *Mysterien des Osiris*), used by Loisy, 131), from aboriginal sacrificial rites (examples quoted Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters*, 195, 196), the magical papyri (Reitzenstein, *Hell. Myst.*, 31, 69, *Poimandres*, 17, 20, 21, 166; Bousset, *K.C.*, 114 *f.*, 342 *f.*), the hermetic books (Bousset, 132 *ff.*, 166), which Cumont regards as having "only a literary influence" in the West (*op. cit.*, 341), two (not "many," as Dill, 547, 548) late fourth-century altar inscriptions (*renatus in æternum*, *C.I.L.*, vi. 510, 736), and even the Emperor Julian (Bousset, *K.C.*, 139, from Sallustius, *de diis et mundo*, 4—a translation in Murray, *op. cit.*, 187 *ff.*), that any parallel between the mysteries and Christianity can be drawn. And even so, though the idea of "supernatural influence" may thus be imported into the mysteries, there is little suggestion that it was thought to have ethical results. The hermetic writings are no doubt moral in tone, and so was Julian, but Loisy (*op. cit.*, 82, 83) and Kennedy (217, 219) are surely right (as against Cumont, 60 *ff.*, 138; and Angus, 244) in suggesting that the moral interest of the mystery religions was originally slight and secondary, and indeed foreign to the character of the cults themselves. It seems far better to find the origin of the ideas of grace, both as such and as an ethical force, in the Old Testament prophets and eschatology (so H. Windisch, *Taufe und Sünde*, 8-50; Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters*, 174, 241; E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge*, iii. 393; and in effect Kennedy, 155 *ff.*).

B. The Phrase "Semi-Physical Force."

A curious example of the fruitless attempt to distinguish between "personal influence" and "quasi-physical force" may be found in the late Mr. C. W. Emmet's essay in *The Spirit*. The instance he takes is that of the influence of a conductor over the members of his orchestra, and this he calls "a subtle influence not easy to analyze or explain," "personal magnetism," "a kind of telepathy" (p. 162), but expressly distinguishes it from "an external semi-physical 'something' which comes into certain souls at certain times and under certain conditions like an electric current" (p. 164). He is prepared to define the ascendancy of the conductor over his orchestra as an "influence which gives power," but rejects the phrase "an infused force" of the resultant enhancement of execution in the orchestra. In spite of the deep respect justly earned by all Mr. Emmet's contributions to English theology, it is hard to resist the conclusion that in this matter he was misled into treating as real what in truth were purely verbal differences. To accept the analogy of magnetism and reject that of the electric current; to admit an activity which "gives power" and deny one which "infuses force"; to allow the phrase "a subtle influence" and reject "an external 'something'"; is surely no more than juggling with words. If any real distinction lies behind these verbal contrasts, it is obviously one so subtle as to forbid a writer assuming that his readers are familiar with it; but this assumption is made without question or hesitation, not only in Mr. Emmet's essay, but by every writer who attacks the doctrine of the sacraments on these grounds.

C. Irrational Expositions of Sacramental Doctrine.

The first of the errors alluded to above (the basing of the importance of Baptism and Eucharist wholly upon authority) is characteristic of not a little Anglican teaching, especially in the form which appeals solely to

the authority of Christ in instituting the rites. Often enough, no other argument is used to establish the essential *rightness* of the sacrament; and further inquiry is, if anything, deprecated, as in the quatrain popularly attributed to Queen Elizabeth:

> " His was the word, He spake it,
> He took the bread and brake it;
> And what His word doth make it,
> I for that same do take it."

The danger of this argument from sheer authority is twofold. It implies an arbitrariness in God, a superiority of Divine command to all considerations of reason, which is closely akin to magic, and wholly foreign to the true spirit of Christian theology, with its insistence upon a full, though reverent, use of the reason in considering the mysteries of faith. (*Cp.* the valuable discussion of a similar attitude towards the ethical precepts of Christ in H. Rashdall, *Conscience and Christ*, p. 26 *ff.*) And in the second place it relies upon an historical basis which is at all events open to question; for it cannot with absolute certainty be urged that our Lord Himself instituted either of the sacraments of the Gospel. These weaknesses of much conventional Anglican exposition deserve closer attention than is commonly given to them.

The second error—that of elevating the material causes of the sacrament (*i.e.*, the *agent*, *matter*, and *form*) into the efficient and formal causes—is perhaps more of a danger in Roman than in Anglican thought, and arises from the desire to simplify doctrine for the uneducated. The priest, the elements of bread and wine, and the formula of consecration are no doubt the *minimum conditions of validity* of the Eucharist, but no responsible theologian would think of mistaking conditions of validity for grounds of efficacy. The sentence used by the Bishop of Birmingham, " The priest . . . by correctness of ritual . . . endows inanimate matter with spiritual character," no more represents the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist than the sentence, " The guard by blowing his whistle starts the train," explains the facts of railway locomotion; or the sentence, " Painting is the art of representing solid objects on a flat surface by means of pigments," exhausts the truth about a Raphael Madonna. In each case a fragment of the truth (and one dealing with conditions rather than causes) has been isolated from its context, and treated as though it conveyed the whole truth about the origin of the effect in question. But in each case the real cause and method of the operation is wholly ignored.

D. The Real Presence—" in " the Service or " in " the Elements ?

It might be suggested that the rationale of the Eucharist given in the text lends colour to the assertion, sometimes made, that " the Real Presence of Christ is not in the elements, but in the whole service." It should be noticed that this assertion is not necessarily " subjective " or " receptionist "; it may be the objective gathering together of the worshippers which is thought of as the condition of the Presence, not their subjective states of minds. And, again, it can be urged that no such dichotomy between the " service " and the " elements " is theologically justified; tradition has never claimed a Real Presence in association with any elements except in so far as the latter have been consecrated at a " service " or gathering of the Church (small and symbolic though that

gathering may sometimes be), in the manner authorized by the Church, and for no other destination than consumption by members of the Church. There can, therefore, be no consecration of the elements apart from a "service," and the "service" may legitimately be said to continue until the elements are consumed. We are also justified in protesting against the suggestion of localization insinuated by the emphasis on the word "in," which, as Catholic theology has always insisted, has no local significance, but merely implies that the consecrated elements are the "matter" of which the Presence is the "form." But if controversy forces us to choose between the two alternatives suggested, it is surely no more than reasonable to suggest that the "visible focus" (if we may use the expression) of the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist must be that for which and around which the congregation is gathered, rather than the gathering together of the congregation; otherwise the whole act of consecration and communion becomes merely secondary, and its omission would not affect the ultimate spiritual value of the assembly. The whole point is well discussed by C. Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 94, with the important quotation from Victorinus Afer, p. 296; *cf.* also p. 148 *ff.*

K. E. Kirk.

MISCELLANEA

STUDIES IN TEXTS

Mark ii. 3, 4: "They come, bringing unto him a man sick of the palsy, borne of four. And when they could not come nigh unto him for the crowd, they uncovered the roof where he was: and when they had broken it up, they let down the bed whereon the sick of the palsy lay."

The *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* has an interesting article by H. Jahnow on this incident (1925, pp. 155-158). The crowd preventing access to the door is an afterthought. The action of the men in bringing the paralytic through the roof was intentional. He was considered to suffer from a spirit or demon. Cheating the demon is a wide-spread practice among primitive peoples. Certain Indian rituals prescribe this very method as a preliminary to exorcism. The patient is to be let down by a "not-door"—*i.e.*, through an aperture other than a door—into the hall. Or, elsewhere, he is to be let down through "the straw" (of the roof).

The idea was that the demon would be cast out by Jesus and would disappear through the hole in the roof, which would then be mended. *He would be unable to return by the door* and so the cure would be permanent.

Matthew omits this piece of demonology, perhaps understanding more about Jewish superstitions than the other Evangelists.

We may add two references from books generally accessible to English readers. Mephistopheles in Goethe's *Faust* (Part I., 1062-64) says:

> "For ghosts and for the devil 'tis a law,
> Where they stole in, there they must forth. We're free
> The first to choose; as to the second, slaves are we."

The *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, art. "Demons and Spirits (Indian)," says:

"Another plan is to endeavour to deceive the spirit, so that it may not find its way back, by taking it out of the house feet foremost, or through a door not usually opened for ingress and egress.

"The Meitheïs never carry the corpse over the threshold of the main door; sometimes a hole is cut in the wall, or the tiny side entrance is used. Among the Maghs of Bengal, when the master of the house has died, the mourners on their return cut away the house ladder and creep in through a hole cut in the back wall, in order to baffle the ghost."

W. K. L. Clarke.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DEATH

Sir,

The criticisms in your September number on the article on the signification of the Transfiguration which appeared in August, turn on the question of the true place of death in human life. This is a much more important subject than it appears to be and deserves careful study. But space forbids more than a few remarks on it.

It is commonly held that death is as natural to man as to the brute creation, since they are all animals alike. Death is, of course, natural to the brutes, and is universal and inevitable for mankind. The question

is whether man does not belong to a different category from the other animals, and whether death is as much a part of the Creator's design for him as for them. Here we are dealing, not with mankind as at present existing, who is "fallen" in old-fashioned language, or, more accurately, according to the Apostle, who has "sinned and falls short of the glory of God," but with the ideal man as conceived (to use the inevitable anthropomorphic language) in the mind of the Creator, and realized in one instance, and one only, our Lord Jesus Christ. And by death is meant that disruption of soul and body which leaves the body a prey to corruption while the soul takes refuge in Hades.

Experience, in the first place, suggests strongly that death is not natural to man. All the incidents of life which are natural are sources of pleasure and occasions of happiness. Birth, food, exercise, work, study, marriage, procreation, the family, all bring enjoyment as legitimate operations of the human mechanism. On the contrary, the idea of death is abhorrent even to the Christian, who, though it has by the mercy of God in Christ become to him the Gate of Life, yet still instinctively regards the gate itself with dread.

To the unfortunate beings who are without the Christian revelation death is unmitigatedly horrible and not to be mentioned on any account. To hear a Chinese widow wailing at the tomb of her husband is one of the saddest experiences imaginable. All is to her dark, undone, hopeless. The instinctive and deep-rooted aversion of mankind to death has been focussed for ever in Æsop's fable of the decrepit old man stumbling and falling under his burden and calling on Death to come and rid him of his miseries. Death appeared and asked him what he wanted. "Oh," said the old man, "I only wanted to be helped up with my burden again." No wonder death has been dubbed "The King of Terrors," and regarded as the great enemy of mankind, the last enemy which Christ is to abolish. How can such an incident be regarded as a necessary and legitimate event in the evolution of life? Universal, inevitable it is no doubt. But experience contradicts those who would call it "natural."

Again, when it is argued that since man is an animal, he must be liable to the same fate as other animals, one of the commonest errors in logic is committed. The reasoning is sound enough, but the premisses are incomplete. Man is an animal, it is true, but he is also something far greater, almost infinitely greater. Endowed with reason, conscience, moral sense, the instinct of immortality, with the power of knowing God as far as He can be known by a finite creature and, above all, with free-will, man towers far above the animals. For the gift of Freewill alone—that power of saying "No" even to the Almighty Himself, is a superb endowment, an emanation of the Divine, the crown of those moral and spiritual faculties which constitute man a son of the living God, made in the image of his Creator. Is it reasonable that such a creature should share the fate of creatures vastly inferior to himself because on one side of his nature he is related to them? Gifted with the faculty of living communion with the Source of all life, should he not have been immune from the weakness attaching to creatures not so privileged? Had he exercised that faculty consistently from the beginning, would not the Divine Life have flowed in unbroken stream into the veins of his spirit and maintained his life, too, on its own undying level? Such unbroken communion was the breath of the life of the Ideal Man. "I live by the Father," He said. Would not the higher law of that Divine Life of which

man is capable have superseded and rendered inoperative the lower law of his animal nature? It is characteristic of higher laws in every department of nature to modify or suspend the operation of lower laws. And the presumption is that they would have done so in the case before us had man obeyed them. Failing to obey them, and choosing to obey the lower laws of his nature, those laws gained the upper hand, and man became subject to their operation in all respects—death included. The essence of sin is the transference of the centre of gravity of life from God to Self. But Self possesses no independent fount of life. It is dependent for its support on the continual communication to it of its Maker's life, as a watch is dependent on its owner for a daily supply of energy. When men withdraw themselves from connection with that Maker and become self-centred, their little store of energy is quickly exhausted and they die. The result is necessary and inevitable. But only to the sinner, be it clearly understood, and not to the ideal man.

The view thus seen to be probable *a priori* is abundantly confirmed by Holy Writ. From the first page to the last of the Bible death in man is regarded as the consequence or punishment of his sin. On the other hand, the work of the Redeemer is revealed to be "the restitution of all things, and especially the destruction of death by the reunion of the unnaturally divorced soul and body at the Resurrection." Out of the many passages which might be cited two only must suffice—viz., the death of Ananias and Sapphira and Rom. v. 12: "Death through sin. And so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned." The phrase is peculiar. It suggests that death spread like a plague from the brute creation to man on account of his sin.

This does not, of course, imply that man was intended to remain for ever on this earth with a material body. This material life is but a phase out of which we should have passed, had we been normal, into the higher, spiritual life as easily and naturally as the child passes from the fœtus life into this life, or the ugly, black grub chasing its prey at the bottom of a forest pond becomes the glorious dragon-fly flashing its beauties through the air in the summer sunlight. When, then, in two of his epistles, St. Paul assures us in the most solemn manner, "by the word of the Lord" (1 Thess. iv. 15, 17), that the natural order will be restored at the Parousia, for then "we that are alive, that are left, shall . . . be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air," we are prepared to believe him, especially as sporadic examples of the operation of the law have been recorded. But it appears to be the fashion nowadays to give the cold shoulder to the Ambassador of Christ, even when speaking *ex cathedra!*

Referring to the remark of Dr. Nairne on the manner of Enoch's removal from this life, I would respectfully ask the learned Professor this question: Supposing he had been writing the Epistle to the Hebrews and wished to say that Enoch did not die, but was taken into the higher life by some other road, what words could he have used to express his meaning more unequivocally than those of the author—"was translated that he should not see death . . . God translated him"? Dr. Nairn may be of opinion that the author was mistaken, and he is entitled to his opinion, as we are to choose between him and the author. But to say that these words "need mean no more than a calm and holy death" is, I venture to think, to trifle with the truth of language.

Yours faithfully,

WILLIAM L. GROVES.

BIRCH VICARAGE,
WORMELOW, HEREFORD.

THE REFORMATION IN NORTHERN ENGLAND

Dr. Hutton, in his review of my book *The Reformation in Northern England*, in the October number of Theology, says that my view of that movement—that it was wholly unpopular and largely heretical, that the laity who supported it did so entirely from political or mercenary reasons, and the clergy who accepted it were simply greedy or terrorized time-servers—is "not true." As proofs, or, perhaps, instances, he says that "the great Bishop Tunstall accepted it—the Reformation—and repudiated the papal supremacy"; that the holiest of all the parish priests, Bernard Gilpin, did likewise; and that Queen Mary put to death more people for religious opinions than Queen Elizabeth did after the Northern Rebellion. I should like to make a remark or two on Dr. Hutton's "history"—and also to assure him that I have been most intimately acquainted with the late Bishop Collins's paper on the Northern Rebellion ever since it was issued as a tract by the Church Historical Society, and regard it as one of the cleverest *ex parte* statements I ever read, and as unreliable as it is specious. And first—Tunstall did *not* accept the Elizabethan settlement; on the contrary, Elizabeth deprived him of his see for his refusal to accept it: so, at any rate, says Dr. Frere in his *History of the English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James*, p. 45, and Dr. Frere is sound enough authority for me. Second—Bernard Gilpin may have been a "holy" man; Wesley, Whitefield, Bunyan were, no doubt, "holy" men, but they were none the less sectaries and schismatics, and if Bernard Gilpin accepted the Elizabethan settlement, *ex animo*, he, too, was a schismatic. But I doubt if he did: I think rather, from all I have read of him and his life-work, that he ignored it and went on with his own labours; certainly he sympathized with and pleaded for the men who took part in the Northern Rebellion. And third, as to the Marian persecutions and the Elizabethan executions. If Dr. Hutton will turn to S. R. Maitland's book *The Reformation in England* (Maitland, it will be remembered, was librarian at Lambeth Palace, and a most patient and careful investigator) he will find a complete list of names of the people who suffered under Mary. It totals precisely 277 people—of whom only two were burned in the North—a highly significant fact. And if he will further turn to vol. xviii. of the *Yorkshire Archæological Journal* he will find therein the most exhaustive paper ever written on the Elizabethan vengeance following upon the Northern Rebellion, by that eminent archæologist Mr. H. B. M'Call (referred to by Dr. Frere in the work above mentioned), and will learn from it that Elizabeth put to death at the very least 500 North-countrymen within a few months of the suppression of the rising. I anticipate Dr. Hutton's retort—these men, he will say, were put to death, justly, for rebellion and high treason. That, of course, is all nonsense—it is as Hallam insisted long since: they suffered because they adhered to the faith of their fathers. There is one remark of Dr. Hutton's with which I am in entire agreement: he says my small book needs—historically—very considerable addition. It does!—it should have had less mildness and reserve, and more insistence on the abominations and cruelties, the lies and treacheries practised upon the Northern people in the name of that Reform which, as Hooker well says, was but a pretence for sacrilege.

J. S. Fletcher.

NOTE

MARTYR OR SACRIFICE

If the implications of St. Paul's teaching in Phil. ii. 8, Gal. iii. 13, and 2 Cor. v. 21 are taken together and worked out they appear to suggest conclusive reasons deciding the question whether our Lord's death upon the Cross was more than a martyrdom in the affirmative; and for claiming that He was in truth also a sacrifice offered by God to experience that separation from Him which is also the consequence of sin.

This conclusion seems to be forced upon one when the clues suggested by the holiness of perfect obedience, and the curse typified by death upon the Cross are worked out along the lines of the doctrines of the divine character as Love and of our Lord's human Nature which all true Christians hold. For:

I. (*a*) Since our Lord's human Nature was that of ideal perfection it was necessary that He should in actual experience achieve the acme of human holiness; and, whatever other heights this may rise to, we must conceive of it as at least including that persisting trust in God under that sense of alienation which is a not uncommon experience of the religious life. Though not uncommon this experience is one of the most severe tests of character, and it could not be claimed that anyone had actually attained the summit of ideal spiritual perfection unless he had triumphantly passed through it; but the cry of "Dereliction" upon the Cross—in which the change of the verb from "hast" to "didst" shows that it was no mere mechanical quotation of the psalm, but one personally applied and adapted to fit His own case—is evidence that such an experience was passed through by our Lord.

(*b*) But if this subjective experience was to reach the true summit of ideal human holiness, then it was also necessary that there should also have been objective reality behind it; for otherwise it could not have had full force in our Lord's perfectly balanced and pure soul. It would indeed have been a failure in faith for Him to think that His Father had withdrawn from Him if there had in fact been no actual weakening of the communion between them on the Father's part. Thus a real withdrawing of His Presence was necessary, such as, in varying degrees, is also the common consequence of sin experienced by men.

We conclude that the perfection of our Lord's human character demanded that He should, in its most severe form, be subjected to, and triumphantly pass through, the experience of alienation from God.

II. Again, since God is love, and perfect love must desire that its object should attain all that is highest and best, it was necessary that the Father should will His Son to pass through this experience, and therefore should provide the opportunity for Him to do so by withdrawing from Him the support of His Presence. It is true that "God tempts no man," but He provides the circumstances which give men the call to follow the higher paths of duty, and this gives opportunity for that temptation to refuse which is sin. It was in this sense that "God did tempt Abraham," and in the same way, because God is love, He had to sacrifice His only-begotten, well-beloved Son and inflict upon Him that experience of forsaken-ness which is also the penal consequence of sin. Not for Himself —as for Abraham—was it possible to provide a way of escape; and it was

in this manner that our Lord as the Good Shepherd and the Suffering Servant was "smitten"—"stricken of God and afflicted."

These considerations appear to be a sufficient explanation of the note of necessity which runs through the Gospels, and of why it was that the Christ "ought" to have suffered these things. We note also that though it happens to have been some words of St. Paul's that suggested this explanation of the "Divine necessity," yet—as having its origin in the fundamental facts of the perfect holiness of our Lord's human nature and the character of God the Father as love—the test of forsaken-ness would have had to be applied and experienced in any case quite apart from any considerations derived from any special features peculiar to St. Paul's doctrine. It arises from doctrines common to the whole of the New Testament and universally accepted by the Christian world.

P. L. Snowden.

REVIEWS

MYSTICISM

THE MYSTICS OF THE CHURCH. By Evelyn Underhill. The Living Church Series, ed. by Professor John E. McFadyen, D.D. James Clarke and Co. 6s.

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE MYSTICS. By Rev. H. M. B. Reid, D.D. The Croall Lectures for 1925. Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd. 7s. 6d.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL AND MENTAL PRAYER. A Selection of Letters and Addresses translated by Joseph Leonard, C.M. Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. 10s. 6d.

THE MIND'S ASCENT TO GOD BY A LADDER OF CREATED THINGS. By Blessed Robert Bellarmin, Cardinal. Done into English from the Latin by Monialis. With a Preface by P. N. Waggett, D.D., of the Society of St. John the Evangelist. Mowbrays. 7s. 6d.

No one who follows with attention the movements of contemporary religious thought can fail to be impressed with the enormous interest evoked by books on Mysticism. Fifty or even twenty years ago, the names of such great mystics as Julian of Norwich, Ruysbroeck, St. Catherine of Genoa, were hardly known. To call a man a mystic was almost an insult, for the word "mystic" meant visionary, religious emotionalist, half-crazy fanatic, even occultist. To-day the mystical writers have been rescued from oblivion, and the word "mystic" has gradually altered its connotation. All who are seriously interested in their own spiritual life and progress feel that they cannot afford to neglect the writings of the experts. Eagerly they buy and read and treasure those books which set forth the experiences of men and women who held familiar converse with God. Ordinary people begin to wonder whether they too may not be, in some degree, mystics too.

To what is this change of attitude due? Largely to the patient work of many students, both Christian and non-Christian, who have established beyond a doubt that the mystic is not a mere freak, a religious abnormality, but a sane and strong and useful individual whose experiences have enormously enriched the corporate life of the Church. The mystic has been proved to be subject to laws of development and progress which are well marked and easily understood. The studies of such psychologists as Henri Delacroix have shown how the mystic grows and learns in obedience to the laws of his own nature, and how much that seems strange and unnatural but marks a

stage on a journey. The mystic is a man whose dominating ambition is union with God. The very fervour and singleness of his desire leads him to despise many things that the ordinary man thinks valuable, and in the course of his quest he sometimes appears unnatural and self-absorbed. When, however, his ambition is satisfied and his goal reached, he turns back to the world and tries to share with others the delights that he has found. He tries to express the inexpressible; all the resources of language are insufficient, but he does his best. The result is often extremely bewildering to those who are aware that the mystic has found something supremely good, and who would gladly share his vision if they could.

The writings of the mystics need interpreters. No English author has done more towards making their dark sayings luminous than Miss Evelyn Underhill. Herself a novelist, an admirable poet, and a scholar, Miss Underhill is able to understand the romantic, the artistic, and the intellectual workings of the mystics' minds. Each book that she produces on the subject of Mysticism shows a firmer grasp, a more complete understanding. In *The Mystics of the Church* Miss Underhill has written a book remarkable for its insight, sympathy, and clearness. She sets forth four main contentions with regard to the mystics. Firstly, that a mystic is not a rebel against his Church because he experiences first-hand communion with the Divine; secondly, that the feelings and ecstasies of the great contemplatives differ in degree rather than in kind from the religious experiences of ordinary men and women; thirdly, that in order to understand any given mystic one must appreciate his place in the history of mystical thought; and, lastly, that the ecstatics and the visionaries, these God-possessed dreamers, are also men and women of action. We see Catherine of Siena reorganizing Italy, Stephen Grellet rebuking popes and kings, Elizabeth Fry originating prison reform. Where there is true prayer and communion there must also be apostolic action. Only a false mystic could live to himself alone.

Miss Underhill gives brief but admirable accounts of the most outstanding mystics in the Christian Church from St. Paul to "Lucie Christine," Charles de Foucauld, and Sadhu Sundar Singh. The only defect in the book is an occasional want of proportion, as when she makes her special favourites—Jacopone de Todi and Ruysbroeck—tower above men who are really their superiors. But she has rendered most valuable service to her readers in showing how the mystics of all countries and ages within the span of Christian Church belong to one great household, a household of which every man and woman of good-will may become a member.

It is perhaps unfortunate, however, that the series in which Miss Underhill's book appears should have been called "The Living Church Series," when the title "Living Church" has been given to a Bolshevist travesty of a church in Holy Russia.

Dr. H. M. B. Reid's book, *The Holy Spirit and the Mystics*, treats the subject of Mysticism very differently from Miss Underhill's. Miss Underhill writes for readers who believe in Mysticism, and who are uncritically eager to love her friends the mystics. Dr. Reid, on the other hand, seems to think that the religious man or woman of to-day must be full of misgivings lest the attractiveness of Mysticism should be dangerous, and are prepared to hide their mystical books under the sofa-cushions should any orthodox divine come into the room. Dr. Reid tries to reassure these timid souls by a learned and orthodox disquisition on the historical development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which doctrine is, he maintains, the foundation of all true Mysticism. His manner is scarcely convincing. Dr. Reid has read too much Theology, too much Metaphysics; his lectures are encumbered with rocky masses of scholarship. He is overshadowed by the cold intellectualism of the modern German critical school and chilled by the bland scepticism of Professor Leuba. Try as he will to hearten the trembling pilgrim on the Mystic Way, he seems merely to alarm him by pointing out all the dangers of the path and the blind alleys that lead him astray.

It is a relief to turn to the beautiful letters of St. Vincent de Paul on Mental Prayer, which have been collected into a handsome volume by Father Joseph Leonard, priest of the Congregation of the Mission.

St. Vincent de Paul is chiefly known as the friend of friendless children, the saint who is represented in picture and statue holding babies in his arms. He was more than this. He was a man who thought deeply on social problems, considering in a spirit of enlightenment far in advance of his time—the seventeenth century—questions of prison reform, sick nursing, the care of the insane, famine relief in war-devastated areas, and so forth. Passionately devoted as he was to the Roman Catholic Church, he yet never believed in the persecution of heretics. Catholics were to convince Protestants by Christ-like lives, and by no other means. His ideas on the subject of women were most modern. The current theories of the day exacted the rigid seclusion of all nuns; St. Vincent de Paul founded the Institute of the Daughters of Charity, an order of religious who, though bound by vows, pursued their noble work of mercy uncloistered.

It stands to reason that such a man as St. Vincent de Paul must be a proficient in prayer, and these charming, simple,

and tender letters of spiritual direction show how deep was his knowledge of the inner life. Most of the letters are addressed to the Blessed Louise de Marillac, co-foundress with St. Vincent of the Daughters of Charity. All the letters are extremely practical, and the whole book is well suited for daily use by readers who wish to learn and practise the art of prayer.

Father Leonard has contributed a most interesting introduction and added such notes as were necessary. The volume is a valuable contribution to the literature of Mysticism.

By its side on the bookshelf of the student of Mysticism should stand *The Mind's Ascent to God by a Ladder of Created Things*, by Cardinal Bellarmin. Father Waggett, who writes the preface, feels that he must apologize for presenting a treatise by a Jesuit controversialist to Anglican readers. The book, however, needs no apologies. It is full of light and sunshine, and admirably fitted to be used in discursive meditation. The spirit that pervades it is akin to that of *Centuries of Meditation*, by Traherne. Bellarmin is something of a poet, keenly aware of the beauty of created things, and using them as jewels to deck the Beauty of Holiness. Such a book is neither Catholic nor Protestant, but the common possession of all those who love to consider God in His glorious works.

AELFRIDA TILLYARD.

SACRIFICE AND PRIESTHOOD, JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN. By S. C. Gayford. Methuen and Co. 6s.

This volume contains the substance of lectures delivered to several generations of theological students at Cuddesdon and Cheshunt. The author informs us that it is published at their request. The purpose, as he also tells us, is that it may serve as an eirenicon between Catholic and Evangelical schools of thought. Its object is to show the close connection between Christian and Jewish ideas of sacrifice, and to lead to a view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice "which includes all that a faithful Catholic would demand as *essential*, and at the same time nothing which the Evangelical is bound by his principles to reject." It would seem that Mr. Gayford has set himself no easy task. Can he be said to have accomplished his end ?

After a brief introduction the book consists of two parts. The first eight chapters, comprising nearly 120 pages, deal with Jewish Sacrifices; the second part—the remainder of the book—with the Sacrifice of the New Covenant, concluding with two chapters on the Christian Sacrifice (*a*) as fulfilled in Jesus Christ, and (*b*) as fulfilled in the Church's life and worship.

Part I., which contains a very detailed and minute descrip-

tion of Jewish Sacrifice, is not very easy to read on account of the abundance of its detail; nor are the presuppositions of the author unassailable. He clearly states in his introduction that he holds that there are spiritual ideas behind the ceremonial acts of the sacrifice, and that such ideas can be accepted by Christian teaching. He is much opposed to the idea, which he describes as "a modern tendency," to confine to the prophets the title to inspiration, and he desires that the spiritual value of the law should be reinstated and vindicated. He holds that just as the prophets themselves taught truths the full meaning of which can only be recognized in the light of Christian revelation, so "the sacrifices were pregnant with deeper truth than anyone realized before a new light was thrown on them by the Death and Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord" (p. 3). This is going very far, but when we find in the opening of Chapter I. that the author speaks of the sacrifices "as the Author of Christianity found them, and used them as the basis of His own religion" (p. 9), we feel that he is making a statement which is open to the very gravest objection. Altogether we are of opinion that in this part of his work there is much which is far-fetched and intrinsically improbable. The most striking illustration of this will perhaps be found on p. 48, where the following passage occurs: "But when we remember 'it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins,' it becomes of deep significance that the highest atoning Sacrifice of the Old Covenant should have been appointed for sins which were not sins. It was a Divine 'irony' for those who could understand, and a hint that these things were only 'a copy and shadow of the heavenly things.'"

It should be observed that the author is dealing with the stage at which the Jewish sacrificial system stood at the birth of Christianity, and that he deliberately excludes from his inquiry the wider subject of the relation of Jewish Sacrifice to sacrifice as practised in other religions (p. 12). It is not that he fails to recognize the importance of such an inquiry, but he deliberately limits the scope of his work. It is, however, at least open to question whether such a limitation is in itself justifiable, and whether, in consequence, the foundation is too narrow to bear the superstructure reared upon it.

One of the main points of the essay is the idea that the word "Sacrifice" has become too closely associated with the idea of the death of a victim, "so that it is doubtful if we shall ever be able to widen its connotation so as to include the thought of offering life rather than death" (p. 2); thus it is suggested that we need two words—Sacrifice and Offering—to convey the complete idea of sacrifice, the one referring especially to the death

and the latter to the presenting of blood. These must not be separated, but regarded as an inseparable part of one indivisible whole. In view of this, the author contends that "it would be a great step in the direction of peace if we could agree to speak of the Eucharistic *offering* rather than the Eucharistic Sacrifice."

The second part of the book—"The Sacrifice of the New Covenant"—will be found far more interesting and readable than the other part. It may, however, be questioned whether Mr. Gayford does not give rather a larger place to the Epistle to the Hebrews than is justifiable. It is hardly possible within the scope of this review to summarize his argument, which is stated in a compressed form. Probably the most valuable part of the book is the concluding chapter, and it is tempting to offer a detailed criticism of his exegesis of the words of the institution (pp. 160-164). These pages deserve careful study. The conclusions which be reaches are five.

1. The Sacrament is not merely a present feast following upon a past sacrifice, for the meal is an integral part of the sacrifice.

2. The Eucharistic Sacrifice is not merely the feast regarded as part of the sacrifice; it includes an offering on our part as well as a receiving.

3. That which we offer is something more than "the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," if by that is meant "the fruit of lips which make confession to His Name."

4. It is not merely the offering of ourselves, our souls and bodies.

5. The Eucharistic Sacrifice does not consist in the pleading of a sacrifice which was completed at some past time, and thus we arrive at the following: "The Eucharistic Offering, which is parallel, or rather identical, with the Heavenly Offering, is also a real Offering." And again, "The reality of the Sacrifice is in Heaven, of which the Earthly is an image;" consequently Mr. Gayford is able to quote with approval the statement that "the sacrifice of the Mass is the same as that offered by our Lord in Heaven" (p. 169).

These conclusions, based as they are almost entirely on Scriptural evidence, are of real interest, and deserve careful attention by those, of whatever school of thought, who desire to see some sort of agreement among Christians with regard to the Sacrament of the Altar. It is the concluding part of the book which is of the greatest value, and it is all too short. It is a real pity that the author did not develop the illustrations of his position which are afforded by the different liturgies of Christendom. The little he has to say on this subject (p. 107 *ff.*) is helpful and illuminating.

We would also commend what he describes as a few disjointed notes, which occupy the concluding pages of the book, while what he has to say of the Eucharist as a propitiatory sacrifice is all too short. It is interesting to compare much that Mr. Gayford has to say with Dr. Burkitt's pamphlet, *Eucharist and Sacrifice*, especially in view of the fact that Mr. Gayford hopes that his work will commend itself to Evangelical readers.

Within the scope of its own self-imposed limits, the book should serve a useful purpose, but those who read it should realize that it only deals with one aspect of the subject, and that, perhaps, not the most important; and just because one aspect of the subject has been isolated, it appears to us to have been unduly stressed. Is it really possible profitably to consider the great mystery of the Eucharistic Sacrifice apart from the deeper metaphysical considerations which of necessity underlie it—those considerations which are in themselves the necessary presuppositions of any rightful treatment of the doctrine of the Incarnation and the sacramental system? And yet it would be unfair to criticize Mr. Gayford for that which he has not attempted to undertake, and we sincerely hope that the book will be widely studied.

H. Leonard Pass.

The Approach to Christianity. By E. G. Selwyn, B.D. Longmans, 1925. 10s. 6d. net.

"The real development of Theology is . . . the process in which the Church, standing firm in her old truths, enters into the apprehension of the new social and intellectual movements of each age: and because 'the truth makes her free' is able to assimilate all new material, to welcome and give its place to all new knowledge, to throw herself into the sanctification of each new social order, bringing forth out of her treasures things new and old, and showing again and again her power of witnessing under changed conditions to the Catholic capacity of her faith and life. To such a development these studies attempt to be a contribution."

These words stand, over the initials C. G., as part of the preface to the first edition of *Lux Mundi* in 1889. Thirty-five years later we have seen the publication of the third volume in the same writer's series entitled *The Reconstruction of Belief*. Between these two dates other groups of writers have followed in the steps of the *Lux Mundi* essayists. Thus the preface to *Contentio Veritatis* (1902) observes that "a very considerable restatement and even reconstruction of parts of our religious teaching is inevitable," and commends the book "to those who

are trying to combine . . . an open-minded pursuit of truth with a heart-felt loyalty to Christ and to the fundamental ideas of Christianity." Similarly, the introduction to *Foundations* (1912) announces that "the world is calling for religion; but it cannot accept a religion if its theology is out of harmony with science, philosophy, and scholarship"; and goes on to speak of the call to "a careful re-examination and, if need be, re-statement of the foundations of . . . belief in the light of the knowledge and thought of the day." And, again: "the principle of combining continuity and progress is one which underlies all sound development."

These examples are enough to show that the duty of expounding the faith in such a way as to make it understanded of the people has not been forgotten in recent years by Anglican theologians; and it may be remarked that by far the most effective work in this sphere has been done by that school of thought which, in some quarters, is labelled "Traditionalist" and supposed to have no message for the "modern mind." No theological group-book of the last forty years can compare in importance and influence with *Lux Mundi;* and no Anglican defender of the faith has won, in that capacity, so wide and attentive a hearing as Dr. Gore.

To this notable series of Apologiæ Mr. Selwyn's new book* belongs; it is described on the cover as "a defence and exposition of Christianity from the Catholic standpoint in the light of modern criticism and psychology," and it is written for "that large circle of readers, of very varying persuasions, for whom truth in religion is of paramount interest and importance, and who are prepared to listen to orthodoxy no less than to Modernism and to weigh the claims of both." We agree with Mr. Selwyn that the circle of such readers is large; and we hope that his attempt to reach it will have the most abundant success. Such a book as this, in one volume and by a single author, is just what is wanted now; one volume is far less formidable than three, while the single authorship promises—and in this case provides—that principle of interior cohesion in which *Contentio Veritatis* and *Foundations* were noticeably lacking.

Mr. Selwyn divides his work into eight chapters. The first is devoted—as always in an Apologia—to a discussion of the present situation; the last deals with "Anglican Theology and English Religion." The intervening chapters provide the basis for the writer's plea that Anglican Theology has not only a message for the present situation, but a permanent and well-grounded claim to the consideration of thoughtful men; their respective themes are "The Grounds of Belief," "History and

* *The Approach to Christianity*, by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn (Longmans, 10s. 6d.

Revelation," "The Christ of History," "The Atonement," "The Risen and Ascended Lord," and "The Supernatural Basis of Christian Character." The last-named chapter* is the only one which evoked in us certain feelings of dissatisfaction. Interesting though it is in itself, we did not feel it to be particularly apposite here; it seemed to lie somewhat outside the general sweep of the author's thought as developed in the book as a whole. It may be doubted whether Mr. Shand's theory of the growth of character, which Mr. Selwyn brings forward, really helps us to understand the New Testament Ethic any better; thus "the creation of a new Christ-sentiment in the heart" says less, not more, than "contact by faith with the risen and ascended Christ"; or at least says it less clearly (p. 233). And we venture to think that any discussion for modern readers of the Christian character and its supernatural basis ought to deal rather fully with the common difficulty of seeing the difference between Christian and non-Christian when the *character* of both alike is highly and conscientiously moral.

We are conscious, however, that this criticism, which other readers may not endorse, only arises because the remaining sections of the book, both in themselves and as parts of the whole, strike us as so eminently satisfactory. Mr. Selwyn begins by pointing out a contrast, which often escapes notice but is certainly there, between the Edwardine Age and the Victorian as regards men's attitude towards Science and Faith. Instead of the old hostility or suspicion there had arisen a sentimental profession of partnership; "religion was to provide the driving-power through its proclamation of the Kingdom of God as the ideal end of social activity, while science was to contribute its knowledge, foresight, and control of natural forces" (p. 4). This belief in the march of civilization—for attacking which, we may remark, Dean Inge earned the soubriquet of "The Gloomy Dean"—ignored two vital realities, sin and freedom. So when the War came, with its proof that these were vital realities, "the doctrine was doomed" (though we may doubt whether all its supporters have even now grasped the fact). The duty of the Christian apologist, then, is to vindicate anew "the reality and the autonomy of the supernatural"—a term which Mr. Selwyn gives sound reasons for preferring to "spiritual" (pp. 15 *ff.*).

In chapter ii. Mr. Selwyn begins this vindication by examining the grounds of belief. The preliminary difficulty of verifying religious experience is illustrated—and diminished—by an analogy from music. An extraordinarily interesting study of John Bunyan's spiritual history follows, in which a skilful

* First published as an article in THEOLOGY, June, 1923.

use is made of modern psychological methods; the upshot is to emphasize "the vital necessity that whatever is mediated in religious experience by human means should be rightly and truly mediated." Mr. Selwyn then admirably shows how the Catholic Church fulfils that very comprehensive function; and he claims that the Anglican branch of the Church fulfils it in the broadest and most generous way.

There follows a highly illuminating study of Revelation, as given through History and especially Biblical History. Modern Biblical criticism is the handmaid, not the enemy, of Revelation; Mr. Selwyn shows how much light it can throw on the connection between the "march of events" and the development of men's thought about God; and he makes the happy choice of the Book of Jonah to illustrate this point. Messianic prophecy looks forward, but still to a revelation of God in History; II Isaiah and the Apocalyptic writers, in their different ways, bear witness to the insufficiency of History alone.

So we come to Him in Whom all these Old Testament ideals find their fulfilment. The central chapters of the book deal with the Son of God Who entered into human history, and died for us, rose again, and ascended. It is the heart of the Catholic Creed, and finds here a noble exposition. Mr. Selwyn will not allow the validity of the distinction between the "Christ of Faith" and the "Jesus of History"; the story of the conversion of St. Paul, analyzed by the aid of psychology,* witnesses to the primitiveness of the identification. The doctrine of the Atonement, again, is a genuine part of the truth as it is—and always was—in Jesus; this death was a satisfaction for sin; He Himself is our Sacrifice and Oblation. His Resurrection and Ascension are historical facts, though no human words can express all that is involved in them—and because Christ is risen and ascended, Christians in every age and place may cherish the presence of their Lord, given to them in three modes—spiritual, mystical, sacramental.

All this, in Mr. Selwyn's hands, is no mere reassertion of orthodox formulæ, with certain necessary concessions to modern critical and psychological conclusions; no "yearly statement," such as Fr. Ronald Knox once satirized, "as to 'What we may still believe.'" Scientific methods are candidly faced and fully used. Thus, to take one example, Mr. Selwyn's exposition of the Atonement† is more orthodox and more satisfactory than Dr. Rashdall's, not because his criticism is less scientific and thoroughgoing, but precisely because it is more so. Catholicism

* This study will be found in Mr. Selwyn's article, "St. Stephen's Place in Christian Origins," THEOLOGY, December, 1922.

† Readers of THEOLOGY will have read part of Mr. Selwyn's treatment of the Atonement in the numbers for October, 1923, and January and March, 1924.

has nothing to fear and everything to gain from new knowledge, from every relevant branch of science truly so called. There is no need for us to keep skeletons in our cupboards.

The Anglicanism which Mr. Selwyn's apologetic so admirably represents is the special theme of his last chapter. Readers of the *Editorials* in THEOLOGY will know what qualities to expect here: loyalty to Catholic tradition, a due regard to Christian experience in all ages, and at the same time a full use of reason, both critical and constructive, and a readiness to face new issues or reopen old ones in the light of new knowledge and new needs. We may doubt whether Evangelists will admit the Evangelical appeal of Sacramental Confession as Mr. Selwyn presents it, though we hope they will; and his remarks on Sunday morning worship and Fasting Communion will certainly not win acceptance in all quarters. As regards this last matter, he is entirely right in saying that "the present situation is as ambiguous and unsatisfactory as it well can be." One side ignores Catholic obligation; the other side sometimes gives the impression that Communion is a mere appendage to the fast. But in all these cases Mr. Selwyn calls us to guide ourselves by seasonable principles instead of prejudice. And we hope that his own plea in connection with the extra-liturgical use of the Blessed Sacrament will commend itself to the highest authorities in the Church.

Here, then, are special problems on which Mr. Selwyn thinks that a genuinely Anglican answer needs to be worked out. But what is Anglicanism? In his judgment it "rests on, and works from, a certain *inward proportion of faith*, in which the three elements of tradition, reason, and experience are combined." Tradition and experience are the steeds of the chariot, the Church, and reason holds the reins; reason, not to be confused with "private judgment," but including the widest possible use of sound learning, and an appeal to rationality as well as to authority. We agree with his analysis, and warmly commend his book to all who value the combination of these same elements in an exposition of the Christian Faith.

ERIC GRAHAM.

NOTICES

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT. By H. Marriott, D.D. S.P.C.K. 15s.

The aim of this book is to reproduce, so far as is possible, by critical methods the original form of the Sermon on the Mount, and to explain its message to our own times. This review is mainly concerned with the former of these two aims. The first stage is to get back, by critical examination of the records of St. Matthew and St. Luke, to the "Q" form of the sermon, and then to consider its relation to the actual discourse

uttered by Jesus; to determine the meaning of His words to those who first heard them, and their application to the needs of our own age. As a preface to this we have a partial discussion of the synoptic problem, or at least of the reconstruction of "Q" from the non-Marcan common of St. Matthew and St. Luke. It establishes the methods which must be applied subsequently to the special instance of the sermon. In view of the need of brevity, of which the author speaks in his preface, it might perhaps have been omitted, or cut down to a necessary statement; but it vindicates the author's claim to work on critical lines, and affords convincing proof of his capacity for such work. It is interesting for the support it gives to the view that it is to St. Luke that we must look for most help in trying to reconstruct the order of "Q." And as written without the help of Dr. Streeter's important volume, it has the further interest of showing the need felt by a competent student for something more than the dual hypothesis to explain St. Luke's use and arrangement of "Q" and Marcan matter. When his results are applied to the particular instance of the sermon, Dr. Marriott naturally finds his safer guide in St. Luke in dealing with "Q" matter. What St. Matthew "collects" from elsewhere in "Q" was *not* part of the sermon as found in "Q." The matter peculiar to each Gospel is then sifted in the same manner. Reasons are found for the view that St. Matthew would very likely omit the "woes" if he found them in "Q," and for accepting his fuller list of beatitudes, as well as his fine illustrations of the "contrast between the old and new moral standards," while he thinks that the contrasts between Pharisaic and Christian "righteousness" did not form part of "Q's" record. We thus get as the outline of that record (1) the Beatitudes and woes; (2) the revision of moral standards; (3) warnings against criticizing others; (4) the duty of discrimination in publishing sacred truth, the good and bad tree and heart; (5) the duty of doing as well as hearing. The next stage is to attempt to get at the original Greek by careful consideration of the language, habits, and preferences of each Evangelist. The work is scholarly, and the reasons given for accepting and rejecting each word or phrase, where we have to choose between the two versions, always sensible, and often ingenious. Some may feel, with the present writer, that the process reveals the fact that the kind of evidence which can thus be adduced is not convincing. We only seem to reach a higher or lower degree of probability in respect of particular words and sentences, which fails to convince us of the correctness of the reproduction as a whole. When we read the three columns of p. 126 *ff.*, "Matthew, reconstructed 'Q' text, Luke," we feel that any one of these may give us a reliable impression of our Lord's teaching on certain subjects at a relatively early period of the ministry, but hardly confidence that the middle column is a real section of "Q," which Matthew and Luke modified in different ways. But when we have worked through the sound and scholarly arguments in support of this column, we know far more about our Lord's teaching than we did before, and our confidence is increased that our knowledge of it is substantial and adequate. And we turn with hearty approval and gratitude to the author's own estimate of his work in his introduction: "I am far from claiming to have succeeded in authoritatively reconstructing the 'Q' text of the sermon. I am well aware of the uncertainty which must attach to the results of any attempt to do so. But, notwithstanding, it seemed worth while to make the attempt."

The second part of the book is of equal value. The long lists of parallels

and affinities to the sermon in earlier Jewish literature and in the rest of the New Testament are careful, thorough, and suggestive. The detailed interpretation of particular clauses and sentences show the same qualities as the rest of the book. And the last chapter, on the value and import of the teaching of the sermon, and its message to our own age, while necessarily slight and sketchy, goes far, in its suggestiveness, to establish its conclusion that "in the Sermon on the Mount we have a priceless document containing a manifold message to the age in which we live, which points out the true and only way along which it can proceed towards a solution of its many and great problems."

A. E. Brooke.

Science and Scientists in the Nineteenth Century. By R. H. Murray, Litt.D. Sheldon Press. 12s. 6d.

The study of the history of science is assuredly a mark of the period in which we live. Great numbers of books appear upon the subject as a whole, and in all its specialized branches. The older kind of history, which concentrated its attention on battles, political mutations, and the family affairs of princes, is dying, if not already dead, and the successions of scientific discoveries interest us more than the exact delimitations of national frontiers. Perhaps it will not be long before these ideas transform the textbooks of the schools, and boys shall learn the date of the discovery of oxygen rather than that of the Battle of Hastings. Dr. Murray certainly moves with this train of thought, and presents us now with 450 pages on the history of science in the nineteenth century.

His method is to select certain great men, and to discuss the discoveries with which they were mainly associated. His choice is excellent. He has three from medicine (Jenner, Simpson, and Lister), one from geology (Lyell), one from physics (Helmholtz), and one from biology (Darwin). Before Darwin there is inserted an illuminating chapter on the precursors of Darwin, and at the end, before the conclusion, there is another on forgotten scientists. The facts seem to be very accurately set forth, but naturally some chapters are better than others, as is inevitable in a work of so wide a scope. For example, the chapters on Lister and Simpson are excellent, and both give one something of the dramatic thrill that comes from reading Dr. Withington's famous paper on Dr. John Weyer and the sixteenth-century witch mania in Singer's *Studies in the History and Method of Science*. Again, the character of Louis Pasteur is well brought out in the appropriate chapter, and this cannot be due to the excellence of his biographers, for similar praise should be given to the picture of Edward Jenner, who has never had a biography of the calibre of M. Vallery-Radot's.

At the same time, considered as history, Dr. Murray's book is a curious one. He is very much concerned with personalities, and tends to hurry over the actual experiments and theories of the workers of the time, without tracing how the ideas set out in one piece of work inspired another or were combated by another. One feels that he is interested in people rather than in ideas. He writes, indeed, a biographical history of nineteenth-century science, with the accent well on the word "biographical," but the title of the book sufficiently indicates its specific orientation. One wishes, however, that its style was a little less inconsequential in places. Dr. Murray can never resist the temptation of dragging in entirely irrele-

vant anecdotes, to the great confusion of the reader's mind. For instance, there is one about Mahomet on p. 5, when we are really talking about Jenner; on p. 52 Macaulay and Thucydides intrude unnecessarily on Lyell; while on p. 323 there is an anecdote whose connection with its context the reviewer, in spite of prolonged thought, has been unable to discover at all. The reader is also dazed from time to time by long strings of rhetorical questions, and there are occasional remarks which will cause scientific workers to shudder—for example, "average F.R.S.'s." It is true that these matters are concerned with individual taste, but the wedding-cake style is surely unfitted for a serious historical work. Little errors are few, but Alcibiades the Just on p. 314 sounds odd!

Since human nature is imperfect, one listens always for the axe grinding behind the scenes in order to know how to introduce the right corrections into our calculation. In Dr. Murray's book the axe is certainly present, but it does not emit the piercing note of the metaphysical doctrinaire, nor yet the low hum of the opponent of Roman Catholicism. It gives forth a sound which one does not remember ever having heard before. On p. 370 he says: "Quite frankly, one object in writing this book has been to show the scientist from the annals of the past that his domain has been, and is, infected with precisely the same virus that has been at work in the field of religion." On p. viii he says: "One is conscious that it has been assumed unquestionably that the theologian is moved by prepossessions, whereas the man of science is moved by nothing else than the desire to ascertain facts as they actually are. . . . There are just as many preconceived notions in science as in theology." This thesis is the note given out by the axe, and it recurs all through the book, which undoubtedly proves its point to the hilt by a consideration of the numberless controversies in science and the neglect of revolutionary theories.

But this point being granted, one does not quite see its significance. Either it means that scientific workers are human beings, in which case the book as a whole is like a steam hammer employed to crack an egg, or else it means that there is some profound similarity between natural science and theology, in which case a more philosophical treatment would surely have been better. Dr. Murray does, indeed, touch on this about p. 390, but hardly does it justice, for it is the essence of the whole question. The scientific mind and the religious mind differ only, it would seem, in the assumptions that they make, and it is on the subjectivity of both of them that emphasis should be placed. Such questions as this greatly need treatment at the present day, and they are implicit in Dr. Murray's data, but he has not, in the reviewer's opinion, sufficiently brought them out.

Indeed, it is his data that are important, and they are very important. Everyone must be grateful to him for having united so completely into one book the biographical history of the greatest scientific workers of the nineteenth century. His book, with its excellent index and valuable bibliography, is undoubtedly a necessity for anyone who is interested in that great period, the Victorian age. And the facts which he has accumulated and set out in order will be of the greatest importance long after the stimulus which prompted him to collect them has lost its significance. Facts, after all, are immortal.

JOSEPH NEEDHAM.

INDEX OF VOLUME XI

JULY—DECEMBER, 1925

PAGE

ALSTON, A. E. 167

Anglo-Catholic Pilgrimage, The 16, 69

Assumption of B. V. M. 101, 163

Baron von Hügel 146

BINDLEY, Dr. T. H. 122

Books on Spiritual Healing 277

Books Reviewed:

- Anglican Revival, The. By G. Brilioth 56
- Anglo-Catholic Movement To-Day, The. By Bishop Gore 122
- Apocryphal N.T., The. By Dr. M. R. James 101
- Approach to Christianity, The. By E. G. Selwyn 351
- Ascetic Works of St. Basil. By Dr. W. K. L. Clarke 233
- Atonement. By H. Maynard Smith 116
- Authority and Obedience and Reservation. By the Bishop of Southwark . 2
- Boethius, de Consolatione Philosophiæ. By A. a Forte Scuto . . . 116
- Cambridge Ancient History, The. Vol. II. 43
- Catholic Reaction in France, The. By D. Gwynn 100
- Conversion: Christian and Non-Christian. By Dr. Underwood . . . 117
- Culte du Saint-Sacrament. By Cordonnier 107
- Doctrine of Grace, The. By Dr. E. Jauncey 180
- Dominican Order in England. By B. E. R. Formoy 236
- Elizabethan Episcopal Administration. By W. P. M. Kennedy . . . 52
- Foundations of Christianity. By K. Kautsky 164
- Foure Birds of Noah's Arke. By Thomas Dekker 119
- German books (Short Notices) 295
- Gospel and the Modern Mind, The. By Dr. W. R. Matthews . . . 294
- How to Enjoy the Bible. By Anthony Deane 299
- Ignorance, Faith, and Conformity. By K. E. Kirk 103
- In Defence of Christian Prayer. By Dr. E. J. Bicknell 288
- Inner Life, The. Liberal Evangelical Group 49
- Kant's Philosophy, Introduction to. By N. Clark 176
- London Charterhouse, History of. By Sir W. St. J. Hope 178
- Mithraism, Select Passages Illustrating. By Dr. A. S. Geden . . . 109
- More Psychology and the Christian Life. By T. W. Pym 238
- Mystère de la Foi. By M. de la Taille 291
- Mystery Religions and Christianity. By Dr. S. Angus 109
- Mystics of the Church, The. By Evelyn Underhill 345
- Nicæa, Council of. By Dr. A. E. Benn 179
- Paul of Tarsus. By T. R. Glover 237
- Problem of the Future Life. By Dr. A. H. McNeile 288
- Psalms of David in Verse. By E. H. Sugden 111
- Psalms, Outlines on. By Dr. A. G. Mortimer 111
- Reformation in Northern England. By J. S. Fletcher 236
- Religion of the Manichees, The. By Professor Burkitt 109
- Religion of People of Israel. By Kittel 283
- Reviews and Studies. By F. J. Badcock 59
- Richard Baxter. By A. R. Ladell 119
- Sacramentary, The. Vol. I. By Ildefonso Shuster 290
- Sacrifice and Priesthood. By S. C. Gayford 348
- St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem. By W. L. Knox 172
- St. Peter's Charter. By P. H. Passmore 298
- St. Samson of Dol. By T. Taylor 235
- St. Thomas Aquinas. By C. Lattey 177
- St. Wilfrid of Ripon. By J. S. Fletcher 119
- Science and Scientists in the Nineteenth Century. By R. H. Murray . . 357
- Sermon on the Mount, The. By H. Marriott 355
- Speculum Mentis. By R. G. Collingwood 59
- Theology of the Real. By. R. G. Milburn 105
- Values of the Sacrament. By W. G. Peck 290
- Winchester Cathedral Statutes. Edited Worthington and Hutton . . . 112
- Short Notices 297, 239

Burney, Charles Fox 99

Church and State in Italy 136

PAGE

Clarke, Rev. W. K. L. 43, 100, 164, 227
Conception of the Church, The 197
Cosmos, Graham and Dr. Otto 282
Creighton, Mrs. 205
Dewar, Rev. L. 263
Editorial 1, 61, 121, 181, 241, 301
Ferris, Rev. T. E. S. 169
First Evensong 167
Four Cases of Conscience 24, 76
Francis of Assisi, Conversion of 214
French Church To-Day 100
Function and Future of Church of England 205
Genesis i. and Nature Worship 11
George Fox, Thoughts on 156
Gibraltar, Bishop of 6, 63
Gordon George, R. E. 136
Goudge, Professor H. L. 186, 246, 303
Groves, Rev. W. L. 86
Guillaume, Professor A. 254, 309
Haines, C. R. 156
Inglis, Rev. G. J. 214
John Newton 92
Kirk, Rev. K. E. 24, 76, 319
Levertoff, Rev. P. 283
Living Church, The 1
Magic and Sacraments 319
Matthew Parker 32
Miscellanea 41, 99, 163, 224, 276, 339
Mozley, Rev. J. K. 49, 197
New Movements in German Thought 227
Newsom, Canon 146
Odes of Solomon 45
Old Catholics and Anglican Orders 224, 277
Orthodox Churches, The 6, 63
Pearce, Dr. E. C. 32
Porter, Rev. W. S. 92
Prayers of the Saints, The 241
Prideaux, Dr. S. P. T. 45
Pridie, J. R. 277
Psychology and Confessional 263
Revised Lectionary, The 130
Robinson, Rev. F. D. 130
Selwyn, Rev. E. G. 1, 61, 121, 181, 241, 301
Servant Poems in Deutero-Isaiah 254, 309
Simple "Fractio Panis," The 169
Southampton and Tennessee 181
Studies in Texts 42, 339
Transfiguration, Significance of 86, 279
Truro, Bishop of 233
What is the Gospel ? 186, 246, 303
Willink, Miss 11
Winchester, Dean of 24, 56, 69
Wisdom, Book of 122
Worcester, Bishop of 52

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER